

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, November, 1902.

## OFFA AND LABHRAIDH MAEN.

AMONG the stories of backward princes who eventually are roused from their inactivity or recover from youthful disabilities, not the least interesting are those which concern Haveloc the Dane and Amlethus, the prototype of Shakespeare's Hamlet. The parallel between the two sagas and the likeness which they present to the tale of the Roman Servius Tullius has been examined by Ward in his *Catalogue of Romances* (i, 428, 429, 435, 860).

A parallelism in some respects even more striking, is that between the stories of the Anglian King Offa I. and Labhraidh Maen, an early Irish hero. As far as I know, this similarity has not hitherto been pointed out, though each story has separately been compared (Müllenhoff, *Beowulf-Untersuchungen*, p. 79; Nutt, "The Aryan Expulsion and Return Formula," *Folk-Lore Record*, vol. iv, p. 33, note) to the well-known tale of the son of Cræsus related by Herodotus. The parallel is not only interesting of itself, but may perhaps also throw some light on the relation between Germanic and Celtic tradition.

In the first place let us look at the Classical story. Herodotus (book I, 85) says that Cræsus, King of Lydia, had a son who was dumb, though in other respects quite normal. When Cræsus sent to Delphi in regard to this misfortune, the oracle replied that the youth should first speak on a day of disaster. So it proved. When the Persians under Cyrus had overcome Lydia, and one of the enemy was approaching to kill Cræsus, the boy cried out: "Man, do not kill Cræsus."

The story of Offa is variously told; but all versions agree in the essential point that he was dumb in his youth and recovered the use of his voice under stress of threatening misfortune. Offa was king of the Angles (*Widsið*, 35) and son of Garmund (*Beowulf*, 1963). He married the beautiful but somewhat intractable Dryðo (*Beowulf*, 1950) and had a son named Eomær (*Beowulf*, 1961). He is, of course, to be distinguished from the Mercian king com-

monly known as Offa II, who lived in the eighth century, though the story with which we are concerned has been transferred in modified form to the latter, as we shall see.

The English tradition in regard to Offa's youth is preserved in the *Vita Offarum* written at St. Albans toward the end of the twelfth century (Müllenhoff, p. 77), and afterward used in the compilation of Matthew Paris' *Chronica Majora* (Suchier, "Sage von Offa und Dryðo," Paul und Braune's *Beiträge*, iv, 507). The *Vita* are printed in Wats' edition of Matthew Paris, but not by Luard in the Master of Rolls' series. Offa I, son of Garmund, is said to have been both blind and dumb from birth. The former affliction continued to his seventeenth year, the latter to his thirtieth. Though a man of great strength he was considered unfit for the royal succession because of his disabilities. At length when the king was old the nobles demanded that he abdicate, and on his refusal collected a great army of malcontents. At a council which had been called by the king to consider the situation, Offa suddenly spoke and offered to oppose the rebel force. When the old king had girded him with his sword and placed him at the head of the army, he put the rebels to flight and killed the two sons of their leader with his own hand. Offa II similarly is said to have been lame, dumb, and blind in his youth, but he recovered the use of his legs, tongue, and eyes simultaneously when the usurper Beornred began to oppress the land (Müllenhoff, p. 77). It is, of course, evident that the latter story is simply a modified version of the former and is due to a confusion between the two Offas.

The Danish tradition concerning Uffo (Uffi) differs very little from the English except in the matter of the battle which followed the hero's recovery. According to the account of Sven Ågesen, Uffi, son of Wermund, was dumb to his thirtieth year. In the *Annales Ryenses* he is represented as dumb from his seventeenth to his thirtieth year (Müllenhoff, p. 77). As will be seen, the resemblance between these versions and that of the *Vita Offa* is strong. The differences appear to be purely fortuitous, though, as Müllenhoff remarks, it is

not necessary to argue any immediate and bookish connection between the two versions.

Indeed, that the Danish accounts like the English sprang from popular tradition seems the more probable since Saxo Grammaticus (lib. iv, §§ 32-35, ed. Holder, p. 106 ff.) agrees with the other Danish versions in the account of Uffo's battle, but gives no details as to the hero's age when he came to himself. Saxo says that Uffo, son of Wermund, was thought dull of wit in his youth and never spoke, though he surpassed all his companions in stature. When Wermund was old and was losing his sight, the King of Saxony sent envoys to demand that he give up the kingdom or let their sons fight in single combat for the realm. In the midst of the consternation which ensued Uffo, who chanced to be present at the reception of the envoys, sought permission to speak, "subitoque velut ex muto vocalis evasit." He offered to fight not only the king's son, but at the same time any other warrior who might be chosen from the enemy. Accordingly he fought the two champions on an island in the Eider and vanquished them, while his father watched the battle from a bridge. So he won his kingdom. This is the tale popularized by Uhland in his ballad *Der blinde König*.

We have thus a well-established Germanic tradition told with apparent independence by two branches of the race. It is unlikely, to say the least, that it was borrowed from the Classical story. Let us look at the Irish tale.

O'Curry (*Lectures on the Manuscript Materials of Ancient Irish History*, p. 252 ff.) summarizes this, but unfortunately he makes no clear statement as to the source from which he took it. From the reference to the *Book of Leinster* on p. 251, however, and from the fact that in an appendix (p. 587) he gives the same title—"The Navigation of Labhraidh"—in his list of "historic tales" contained in that MS., it is probable that he has summarized the account there related. In a note (p. 587, note 156) he indicates that the story is also found in the *Yellow Book of Lecain*, a MS. written toward the end of the fourteenth century. The *Book of Leinster* dates from the first half of the twelfth century.

According to O'Curry's summary Labhraidh Maen or Labhraidh Loingseach (L. the Voy-

ager) was the grandson of Laeghairé Lorc, who ruled over all Erin in the sixth century B. C. Laeghairé Lorc was killed two years after his accession by his brother Cobhthach Cael Breagh, who usurped the throne of Erin. The kingdom of Leinster, however, came into the possession of Ailill Ainé, eldest son of Laeghairé Lorc. Soon afterwards he in turn was slain by Cobhthach and left an infant son named Maen Ollamh. This child was spared by the usurper because he was dumb and, therefore, ineligible to the kingship. He was placed in the care of two officers of the court of Tara, Ferceirtne the poet and philosopher, and Crafiné the harper.

Maen in the course of years grew into manhood

"singularly distinguished by beauty of feature, symmetry of person, and cultivation of mind. One day, however, it happened that while enjoying his usual sports in the play-ground of his father's mansion he received some offense from one of his companions. The insult was promptly resented by a blow; and, in the attempt to suit words to the action, the spell of his dumbness was broken, and the young man spoke. The quarrel was lost in an exclamation of joy raised by his companions, when they all cried out 'Labhraidh Maen! Labhraidh Maen!' ('Maen speaks! Maen speaks!'); and his tutor coming up at the same time, and hearing what had happened, said that henceforth the prince should bear the name of *Labhraidh Maen*, in commemoration of the wonderful event."

When the news came to Cobhthach at Tara the prince and his tutors were promptly banished. After various adventures Labhraidh slew Cobhthach and took possession of the kingdom.

Curiously enough in the *Yellow Book of Lecain* the Midas story of the horse's ears is told of *Labraid Lorc* (cf. *Rev. Celt.* ii, 197). This name appears to indicate some confusion between the grandfather and grandson of our tale, though there is little doubt that the Midas story belongs to Labhraidh Maen, since it is elsewhere told of Labhraidh Loingseach (cf. *Rev. Celt.* ii, 507) which as we have already seen is but another name for our hero. The parallel versions of this story told of March ab Meirchion, the Lord of Castellmarch, etc., need be mentioned only in passing. It is sufficient for our purpose to notice that Welsh and Breton equivalents are in existence. For

further treatment, see Rhys, *Celtic Folklore*, p. 231, and Grimm, *Kleinere Schriften*, iv, p. 216.

Though Mr. Alfred Nutt, in commenting upon the likeness of the two stories told about Labhraidh Maen to those of Croesus' son and Midas, expresses his fear that Labhraidh was simply a "convenient person to whom classical legends might safely be attributed" ("The Aryan Expulsion and Return Formula," *Folk-Lore Record*, vol. iv, p. 33, note), it seems scarcely probable that the tale of his recovery of speech can be regarded as borrowed from the Classics. Indeed, it bears less resemblance to the Greek tale than does the story of Offa. In the first place Labhraidh was an orphan; and Offa, like the Lydian prince, had a father of advanced age. Moreover, as in Herodotus, it was to save his father that the hero of the Germanic tale spoke. In the Irish story it was anger in a quarrel that loosed Labhraidh's tongue. Yet the two stories, Celtic and Germanic, have the characteristic in common that the hero wins a kingdom more or less indirectly through the recovery of his voice. In this they differ from the tale of Croesus' son. If, then, as seems probable, the story concerning Offa is a genuine Germanic tradition is it not likely that the Irish tale was borrowed by the Celtic from that source?

The somewhat scanty evidence that such was the case may be formulated thus. 1. Both the Germanic and the Irish stories, as I have just pointed out, differ from their Classical prototype and agree with each other in one essential point. 2. This agreement shows that the two could not be independent borrowings. Now the fact that the *Book of Leinster* dates from the first half of the twelfth century, and is therefore older than the English and Danish accounts which are preserved, shows that the Offa story could not have been a Classical turn due to the learning of clerics who wrote late in the century. The opposite view, that the widespread Germanic story came from Ireland, need not, I think, be seriously considered. 3. The Germanic influence on Irish saga has been shown to be considerable even in the case of the earlier cycles. Even if one does not accept all the theories of Prof. Zimmer (cf. *Gött. gel. Anzeigen*, 1890, p. 785 ff.; *Zts. für deut-*

*sches Alterthum*, 1891, p. 1 ff.), it cannot be doubted that even the Cuchulinn saga was to some extent modified by the Scandinavian invasion. 4. The story of Labhraidh Maen's youth is not found, to my knowledge, in any Irish collection earlier than the *Book of Leinster*, that is, earlier than the twelfth century. At that period the Scandinavian influence, whatever it was, had had more than two hundred years in which to alter Celtic saga—time enough certainly for an attractive story to attach itself with some change to a king of reputed valor and convenient remoteness. 5. Unlike the Midas story, which is also told of Labhraidh Maen, this tale of his youth is not told of any other Celtic hero either in Wales or in Brittany so far as I know. 6. Even if it be denied that Scandinavians from the Continent carried the story to Ireland, might it not have come from England, which had its legend of Offa's youth? We know the intimate relations between Ireland and the north of England which existed in the time of Olaf Godfreyson and his cousin Olaf Sytrygson during the tenth century. The identity of Offa and Uffi precludes the possibility that the tale was brought to England from Ireland after it had been transplanted there by the Northmen. The converse might, however, be true. I hold no brief for any particular Germanic family as transmitter of the story.

In conclusion I wish to say that I offer this suggestion as to the relations between the stories of Offa and Labhraidh Maen with all humility. Someone with a wider knowledge of Germanic and Celtic literature may be able to offer a better solution to the problem of the relationship. The evidence here adduced scarcely proves, though I think it renders probable, my conjecture that the Irish tale came from the Germanic tradition.

GORDON H. GEROULD.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

# THE LEODILLA EPISODE IN BOJARDO'S ORLANDO INNAMORATO.

(I, xx-xxii.) II.

THIS immediately attracts the attention to the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus, the plot of which is similar in many respects to this story, especially in the first two acts. Pleusicles is in love



with Philocomasium, a courtesan of Athens, who returns his affection. But during the absence of her lover, a captain of Ephesus, Pyrgopolinices by name, comes and having won the favor of the mother carries off Philocomasium much against her will. The servant of Pleusicles, Palestrio, learning of this goes in search of her. His ship is captured by pirates and he is given as a servant to the captain Pyrgopolinices. He talks with Philocomasium, who informs him that she hates her master cordially, and that she would gladly return to Athens. Palestrio writes to his master who comes forthwith and lodges in the house of Periplecomenus, which adjoins that of the braggart captain. The servant then makes a passage through the house-wall so that the two lovers can meet each other. Sceledrus, another servant of the Captain's who is entrusted with the watching of Philocomasium, is chasing a monkey along the roof and looking through the skylight sees Philocomasium in the room of Pleusicles. The case is critical. It is Palestrio's business to extricate them from their difficulty. He brings this about in practically the same way that Leodilla and Ordauro deceive Folderico. He invents the story of the twin sister who has come to look for her twin. Act ii, v. 237.

PALESTRIO. Nunc sic rationem incipissam, hanc instituum astutiam:

Ad Philocomasium huc sororem geminam germanam alteram

Dicam Athenis aduenisse cum amatore aliquo suo,

Tam similem quam lacte lactist: aput te eos hic deuortier

PERIPLECOMENUS. Dicam hospito. Euge, euge, lepide: laudo commentum tuum.

PALESTRIO. Vt, si illanc concriminatus sit aduersum militem

Meus conseruos, (se) eam uidisse hic cum alicuo auscularier,

Arguam (hanc) uidisse aput te contra conseruom meum

Cum suo amatore amplexantem atquo ausculantem.

Sceledrus is extremely incredulous, but after having seen Philocomasium in both houses wearing different dresses and after she has appeared to him coming from both houses in a manner quite incomprehensible to him (since he knows nothing of the passage), he comes to the conclusion that he did not see what he did see, as Palestrio puts it. The resemblance in

these points is striking and there are some other similarities which suggest that Bojardo was influenced by the Latin comedy in the composition of his narrative. In both cases the lady is tricked and carried off against her will by a ridiculous person whom she despises so that there is good reason for the watchfulness of the husband in the one case, and that of the slave in the other. In both cases, too, the lover follows his mistress from a distance, and both find a similar means of approaching her. Both agree in omitting the episode of the ring, or the clothes of the Latin version, as a preparatory step to the deceit which is to follow. The idea of the banquet seems without any doubt to have been taken from the *Sette Savi*, although Sceledrus too goes into the house of Periplecomenus, where he sees the two lovers together, v. 519 sq., whereupon he hastens back to his master's house where he sees her, she having returned to her room by the passage through the wall.

The incredulity of Sceledrus resembles much more closely the obstinacy of Folderico in believing the verdict of his senses than the mild behavior of the husband in the *Libro dei Sette Savi*. Thus Sceledrus, v. 345 sq.

Agedum ergo face. uolo scire, utrum egone id quod uidi uiderim

An illic faciat quod facturum dicit, ut ea sit domi.

Nam ego quidem meos oculos habeo nec rogo utendos foris.

Set hic illi supparasitatur semper: hic eae proxumust:

Primus ad cibum uocatur, primo (ei) pulmentum datur.

Nam illic noster est fortasse circiter triennium:

Nec quoquam (alii) quam illi in nostra meliust famulo familia.

Set ego hoc quod ago, id me agere oportet: hoc opseruare ostium.

Si hic opsistam, hac quidem pol certo uerba mihi numquam dabunt.

It is not till he has seen Philocomasium appear in and coming from both houses several times that he will admit that she whom he has seen is really the twin sister. So Folderico:

37. . . . .  
Diceva il vecchio: non mi vender foglie,  
Chè io vedo pur di certo e non son cieco,  
Che questa è veramente la mia moglie;  
Ma pur, per non parer pazzo ostinato,  
Vado a la torre e mo sarò tornato.

Finally according to Leodilla he is convinced;

44. Cost più volte in diversa maniera  
Al modo sopradetto fui mostrata,  
E sì fuor di sospetto il geloso era,  
Che spesso mi appellava per cognata.

As Sceledrus bursts from the house where he



has been to see the supposed twin to Philocomasium he exclaims, v. 529 sq.:

Pro di immortales, similiorem mulierem  
Magisque eandem, (tam) quæ non sit eadem, non reor  
Deos facere posse.

This recalls the exclamation of Folderico as he enters his wife's chamber on returning from the banquet of Ordauro's in the last verses of the thirty-ninth stanza and the first of the fortieth.

Come fu dentro ed ebbemi veduta,  
Maravigliossi e disse: Iddio mi aiuta.  
40. Chi avria creduto mai tal maraviglia,  
Nè che tanto potesse la natura,  
Ch'naa germana sì l'altra simiglia  
Di viso, di fazione e di statura?

Palestrio had thus outlined Philocomasium's course of conduct, v. 186:

Vt eum qui se hic uidit uerbis uincat ne is se uiderit.  
Qui arguat se, eum contra uincat iure iurando suo.  
Si quidem centiens hic uisa sit, tamen infitias eat.

This is just what Leodilla does when Folderico accuses her of leaving the castle:

42. Ora non dimandar com'io giurava  
Il ciel e i suoi pianeti tutti quanti;  
Quel sì fa per ben, Dio non aggrava,  
Anzi ride al spergiuo degli amanti,  
Così ti dico, ch'io non dubitava  
Giurare e l'alcorano e i libri santi,  
Che da poi ch'era entrata in quel girone,  
Non era uscita per nulla stagione.

The *Miles Gloriosus* must have been at least as familiar to Bojardo as the *Libro dei Sette Savi*. According to Reinhardtstoettner (*Plautus*, pp. 18-19) the manuscript containing the *Miles Gloriosus* was discovered in 1428 or 1429 by Nicolaus of Trier. In the year 1472 the Editio Princeps appeared, or about ten years before the first two books of the *Orlando Innamorato* were completed. Among the princes who promoted the studies leading to the Renaissance none were more zealous than Ercole I., Prince of Ferrara, who took especial delight in having the plays of Plautus represented in his theatre. In 1486 he had the *Menæchmi* given, and there is a tradition that he translated it himself. The *Amphitruo* was given in 1487 and 1491 in the version of Colenuccio. Gregorovius says of him in his *Lucrezia Borgia* i, 227:

"Er war einer der leidenschaftlichsten Begründer des Renaissance-theaters. Er hatte schon viele Jahre zuvor von Dichtern an seinem Hofe Stücke des Plautus und Terenz in terza rime übersetzen und dann aufführen lassen. Guarino, Berrardo, Colenuccio, selbst Bojardo, haben für ihn zu diesem Zwecke gearbeitet."

For Bojardo's activity in this line of work see also D'Ancona, *Origini del Teatro Italiani*, ii, 135 sq. While we do not know of any special comedy of Plautus which Bojardo translated or popularized in this way, it is certain that he did work of this kind, for there is a play or representation of which he is the author, and on its title-page it bears this inscription:

"Commedia del Magnifico Conte Matteo Maria Bojardo, conte di Scandiano, tradotta da un Dialogo di Luciano, a compiacenza dello Illustrissimo Principe signor Ercole Estense Duca di Ferrara."

There is then every reason for believing that Bojardo was well acquainted with the *Miles Gloriosus*. Hence, instead of believing with D'Ancona (cf. edition, p. 120) that Bojardo has made of the *Moglie Involata* of the *Libro dei Sette Savi* the episode of Folderico and Ordauro ("Il Bojardo ne ha fatto l'episodio del vecchio Folderico e di Ordauro"), we should rather hold that this episode is a welding together of the two elements, the Classical and the popular; the poet adding much of his own native material in the characterization of the personages. Such a fusion is quite in harmony with the spirit of the Bojardesque narrative.

However, Leodilla's troubles were not over even after she had succeeded so well in getting away from her detestable husband. For the second day as they were riding joyfully along their way they perceive a page who is fleeing at full speed before a villain who is evidently trying to kill him with his lance. The page is in great distress calling for aid. Ordauro is moved to pity and starts out to save the boy. But the chase is long and takes him away from his mistress. No sooner has he disappeared than Folderico appears with a large force of armed men and Leodilla again becomes his prey. This treacherous device is sometimes met with in the old Romances of Adventures; so, for example, in the *Lancelot* which I have to quote from the *Romans de la Table Ronde mis en nouveau langage par Paulin Paris*, vol. 4, p. 60:

"Nos quatre chevaliers demeurent en aguet, et bientôt Lancelot entend la pucelle crier: 'A l'aide! à l'aide!' Il s'élance dans le courtil et voit à peu de distance vingt fer-armés qui attaquent deux chevaliers couverts des armes du roi Artus et de Gaheriet. Il broche vers eux; mais ceux qu'il venait défendre le saisissent et le font tomber de cheval . . . Le même piège

attendait Hector et messire Gauvain. Désarmés à leur tour, ils sont liés et conduits dans une grande geôle où ils eurent tout le temps de maudire la messagère de la perfide magicienne.

As Folderico is carrying her away by a long detour through a dark valley to escape Ordauro, the three giants appear, kill the husband, and in this state she is rescued by the knights Orlando and Brandimarte in the manner already seen.

The three cantos containing the Leodilla episode represent in miniature the whole work. A romantic episode is introduced, then interrupted to give place to a description of the battle between Rinaldo and the champions of the traitor Truffaldino—quite in the style of those battles which the vassals of Charlemagne were in the habit of fighting. The story is then resumed, blended together out of Classical and popular elements, and ends with the introduction of new adventures—Brandimarte's pursuit of the stag. He disappears and the canto comes to an end.

COLBERT SEARLES.

Leland Stanford Jr. University.

GOLDSMITH AND THE NOTIONS  
Grille AND Wanderer IN WERTHERS  
LEIDEN. II.

It may still further be shown that actual thoughts and feelings of the sentimental young author in regard to Lotte Buff found an echo both in his own and in Goldsmith's poem. After Charlotte's wedding, he wrote in May, 1773, to Kestner that a poem of his would appear in the (Göttinger) *Musenalmanach*, which no one should better understand than Kestner and his young wife; that it bore the title, *Der Wanderer*, and began: "Gott segne dich iunge Frau." On Sept. 15th of the same year, he mentioned in another letter to Kestner the page of the almanac where the latter would find the poem, adding: "er binde es Lotten ans Herz." He then remarks: "Du wirst unter der Allegorie Lotten und mich, und was ich so hunderttausendmal bey ihr gefühlt erkennen." The *Wanderer* of the allegory is, accordingly, Goethe himself, and Lotte Kestner the young wife upon whom he invokes a blessing. Before becoming enamored of Lotte, he had, moreover, sent a copy of the poem to

Herder's sweetheart, Caroline Flachsland, who was greatly delighted with it. It may be safely assumed that the sight of these happy young couples kindled in his heart a desire to follow their example. This was at that time the wish of his parents. That he was himself disposed to wed is proved by his engagement to Lili in 1775, the year after the publication of *Werther*.

Let us now compare the two poems, and we shall easily recognize the thoughts and feelings that animated the young poet at that time. The sight of a young peasant wife and her cottage built amid the ruins of an ancient Roman temple of Venus, awakens in the heart of Goethe's wandering stranger the longing that he, on his return home, might also be welcomed in his cottage by such a wife:—

Und kehr' ich dann am Abend heim  
Zur Hütte, vergüllet  
Vom letzten Sonnenstrahl,  
Lass mich empfangen solch ein Weib  
Den Knaben auf dem Arm!

In his wanderings in foreign parts, Goldsmith's Traveller finds very similar scenes of simple, domestic happiness. In Italy, his attention is arrested by a peasant's cot amid the ruins of the palaces of the Roman emperors:—

As in those domes, where Cæsars once bore sway,  
Defaced by time and tottering in decay,  
There in the ruin heedless of the dead,  
The shelter-seeking peasant builds his shed:  
And, wondering man could want the larger pile,  
Exults, and owns his cottage with a smile.

In Switzerland, his heart is gladdened on beholding its contented peasant life:—

At night returning, every labour sped,  
He sits him down the monarch of a shed;  
Smiles by his cheerful fire, and round surveys  
His children's looks, that brighten at the blaze;  
While his loved partner, boastful of her hoard,  
Displays her cleanly platter on the board;  
And haply too some pilgrim, thither led,  
With many a tale repays the nightly bed.

Like Goethe's *Wanderer*, the Traveller returns home with the conviction that in every land man's true happiness does not depend upon laws and rulers, but is to be found in the quiet joys of family life:—

Vain, very vain, my weary search to find  
That bliss which only centres in the mind;<sup>5</sup>  
Why have I strayed from pleasure and repose,  
To seek a good each government bestows?  
Still to ourselves in every place consigned,

<sup>5</sup> "Ach so gewiss ist's, dass unser Herz allein sein Glück macht," Werther exclaims (WA., p. 62).

Our own felicity we make or find:  
With secret course, which no loud storms annoy,  
Glides the smooth current of domestic joy.

To show how exactly the young Goethe's social and political standpoint coincided with that of Goldsmith, I will add the following quotation from a review written by him in 1772 (DjG., vol. 2, p. 429):—

"Wenn wir einen Platz in der Welt finden, da mit unsern Besitztümern zu ruhen, ein Feld uns zu nähren, ein Haus uns zu decken, haben wir da nicht Vaterland? Und haben das nicht tausend und tausende in jedem Staat? und leben sie nicht in dieser Beschränkung glücklich?"

The frequent use of contrast is perhaps the most striking characteristic of Goldsmith's technique. The rhetorical device is employed again and again in all three of his chief productions: in the *Traveller*, the *Deserted Village* and the *Vicar of Wakefield*. In all three, the contrast between the restless, discontented life of the wanderer and the contentment and domestic felicity of the cottager, plays an important part.

Let us now turn again to *Werther*. In the first book (Am 21. Junius), we read the following meditation upon the two contrasting tendencies in human life:—

"Lieber Wilhelm, ich habe allerlei nachgedacht über die Begier im Menschen sich auszubreiten, neue Entdeckungen zu machen, herumzuschweifen; und dann wieder über den innern Trieb, sich der Einschränkung willig zu ergeben, in dem Geisse der Gewohnheit so hinzufahren, und sich weder um Rechts noch um Links zu bekümmern" (WA., p. 38).

But his reflection is not based on the observation of others alone; it is the result of his own experience. He is himself a *Wandrer*:—

"Wie oft habe ich das Jagdhaus, das nun alle meine Wünsche einschliesst, auf meinen weiten *Wanderungen*, bald vom Berge, bald von der Ebene über den Fluss gesehen" (WA., p. 38).

Again, in the second book (Am 9. Mai), looking back upon his life, the returning wanderer tells us:—

"Damals sehnte ich mich in glücklicher Unwissenheit hinaus in die unbekannte Welt, wo ich für mein Herz so viele Nahrung, so vielen Genuss hoffte, meinen strebenden, sehrenden Busen auszufüllen und zu befriedigen" (WA., p. 108).

Like Goldsmith's *Traveller* and Goethe's *Wandrer*, like Burchell in the *Vicar of Wakefield* and the youthful Goethe himself in *Sesen-*

heim, Werther's heart is touched on beholding the simple, domestic joys of the humble cottager, whom he discovers on his *Wanderungen*. Of the schoolmaster's daughter in his favorite village, the rambling hero writes:—

"Ich sage dir, mein Schatz, wenn meine Sinne gar nicht mehr halten wollen, so lindert all den Tumult der Anblick eines solchen Geschöpfes, das in glücklicher Gelassenheit den engen Kreis seines Daseins hingeht, von einem Tage zum andern sich durchhilft, die Blätter abfallen sieht, und nichts dabei denkt, als dass der Winter kommt" (WA., p. 20).

Why so? For the reason that he himself sometimes feels the desire to relinquish his roving life and "sich der Einschränkung willig zu ergeben." The proof of this is found in a letter of the second book (Am 20. Januar). Werther leaves the town, the "traurige Nest," and renews once more his wanderings. He takes refuge from a heavy storm in a "geringe Bauernherberge"; and here he writes to Lotte:—

"und jetzt in dieser Hütte, in dieser Einsamkeit, in dieser Einschränkung, da Schnee und Schlössen wider mein Fensterchen wüthen, hier waren Sie mein erster Gedanke. Wie ich hereintrat, überfiel mich Ihre Gestalt, Ihr Andenken, Lotte! so heilig, so warm! Guter Gott! Der erste glückliche Augenblick wieder" (WA., p. 96).

Why do *Hütte* and *Einschränkung* remind him at once of Lotte? Because of his longing to call Lotte his own and to share a cot with her.

Yet Werther's soul, like that of Goldsmith's *Traveller*, is darkened by pessimistic thoughts of the vanity of all things earthly. Compare the following three quotations. With regard to the literature of England as the external occasion of the "Lebensüberdruß" prevalent among the young men of Germany in the Werther period, Goethe writes in DW. (WA., I., vol. 28, p. 213):—

"und wohin kann der Ernst weiter führen, als zur Betrachtung der Vergänglichkeit und des Unwerths aller irdischen Dinge."

Of the melancholy works in question Goethe mentions especially Goldsmith's *Traveller*, in which stand these lines:—

But me, not destined such delights to share,  
My prime of life in wandering spent and care;  
Impelled, with steps unceasing, to pursue  
Some fleeting good, that mocks me with the view:  
That, like the circle bounding earth and skies,  
Allures from far, yet, as I follow, flies;  
My fortune leads to traverse realms alone,  
And find no spot of all the world my own.



In a letter (Am 21. Junius) already cited, which contains several other reminiscences of the *Traveller*, we read:—

"O es ist mit der Ferne wie mit der Zukunft! Ein grosses dämmerndes Ganzes ruht vor unserer Seele, unsere Empfindung schwimmt darin wie unser Auge, und wir sehnen uns, ach! unser ganzes Wesen hinzugeben, uns mit aller Wonne eines einzigen, grossen, herrlichen Gefühls ausfüllen zu lassen.—Und ach! wenn wir hinzueilen, wenn das Dort nun Hier wird, ist alles vor wie nach, und wir stehen in unserer Armuth, in unserer Eingeschränktheit und unsere Seele lechzt nach entschlüpftem Labsale" (WA., p. 39).

Traveller, wanderer, pilgrim, vagabond are Goldsmith's terms for the same general conception, whose prototype was himself. His wanderer George in the *Vicar* (Chap. 20) entitles the narrative of his travels: "The History of a Philosophic Vagabond, pursuing Novelty, but losing Contentment."<sup>6</sup> Werther's terms are *Wandrer*, *Umherschweifender*, *Herumlaufender*, in der *Irre Herumziehender*, *Waller*, *Pilger*, *Pilgrim*, *Vagabund*. The letter of June 21 contains the following meditation—clearly a reminiscence of the *Traveller*—upon the wanderer returning to his cot:—

"So sehnt sich der unruhigste Vagabund zuletzt wieder nach seinem Vaterlande, und findet in seiner Hütte, an der Brust seiner Gattin, in dem Kreise seiner Kinder, in den Geschäften zu ihrer Erhaltung die Wonne, die er in der weiten Welt vergebens suchte" (WA., p. 39). And Werther himself is a returning wanderer. Like the dejected wayfarer of the *Traveller*, above all of the *Deserted Village*, he revisits as a lone and melancholy pilgrim the scenes of his boyhood. He writes (cf. above, p. 11):—

"Ich habe die Wallfahrt nach meiner Heimat mit aller Andacht eines Pilgrims vollendet, . . . . . Damals sehnte ich mich hinaus in die unbekannte Welt, . . . . . Jetzt komme ich zurück aus der weiten Welt" (WA., p. 108).

The letter just quoted (Am 9. Mai) is, as I have said above, replete with reminiscences of Goldsmith, especially of the *Deserted Village*. Another passage in Goethe's own account of the part played by English literature in producing the gloomy spirit of those times of which Werther is an embodiment, runs:—

<sup>6</sup> A lack of contentment was also a fault of the wanderer Werther, who in the first letter of the second book exclaims: "Guter Gott, der du mir das alles schenkest, warum hieltest du nicht die Hälfte zur.ck. und gabst mir Selbstvertrauen und Genügsamkeit."

"und selbst der heitere Goldsmith verliert sich in elegische Empfindungen, wenn uns sein *Deserted Village* ein verlorenes Paradies, das sein *Traveller* auf der ganzen Erde wieder sucht, so lieblich als traurig darstellt."

According to this, elegiac thoughts and feelings that are to be referred to Goldsmith's pathetic poem, should be sought in our novel; and, in fact, several such are found in the letter of May 9.

In the first place, the general conception is in both cases the same—that of the wanderer returning from the wide world, sorrowful and dejected, to his birthplace. This is proved by the opening lines of the letter as just quoted.

Secondly, the wanderer returns in both cases, not to the domestic joys of which he dreamed, but with many disappointed hopes: "O mein Freund! mit wie viel fehlgeschlagenen Hoffnungen, mit wie viel zerstörten Plänen!" In the *Deserted Village* we read:—

In all my wanderings round this world of care,  
In all my griefs—and God has given my share—  
I still had hopes my latest hours to crown,  
Amidst these humble bowers to lay me down;

And, as a hare, whom hounds and horns pursue,  
Pants to the place from whence at first he flew,  
I still had hopes, my long vexations past,  
Here to return—and die at home at last.

Thirdly, the reawakened remembrance of the past kindles in the hearts of both an emotion of tender melancholy:—

"An der grossen Linde, die eine Viertelstunde vor der Stadt nach L . . . zu steht, liess ich halten, stieg aus und hiess den Postillon fortfahren, um zu Fusse jede Erinnerung ganz und lebhaft, nach meinem Herzen zu kosten."

Compare this with the following lines:—

Here, as I take my solitary rounds,  
Amidst thy tangling walks and ruined grounds,  
And, many a year elapsed, return to view  
Where once the cottage stood, the hawthorn grew,  
Remembrance wakes with all her busy train,  
Swells at my breast, and turns the past to pain.

Fourthly, characteristic objects singled out by Werther in fond remembrance are the same as such found in the *Deserted Village*. These are:—

*The Tree*. For Werther, see the passage quoted above. So the *Deserted Village*:—

How often have I blessed the coming day,  
When toil remitting lent its turn to play,  
And all the village train, from labour free,  
Led up their sports beneath the spreading tree.

*The School*. Werther:—

"Im Hingehen bemerkte ich, dass die *Schulstube*, wo ein ehrliches altes Weib unsere Kindheit zusammengepfircht hatte, in einen Kramladen verwandelt war. Ich erinnerte mich der Unruhe, der Thränen, der Dumpfheit des Sinnes, der Herzensangst, die ich in dem Loche ausgestanden hatte."

*Deserted Village:—*

Beside yon straggling fence that skirts the way,  
With blossomed furze unprofitably gay,  
There, in his noisy mansion, skilled to rule,  
The village master taught his little school;  
A man severe he was, and stern to view,  
I knew him well, and every truant knew;  
Well had the boding tremblers learned to trace  
The day's disasters in his morning face;

*The Cottage.* The article is here used in the generic sense. The cottage is, as well as the tree and the school, a typical feature of the two birthplaces, both which are scenes of rural simplicity. Werther:

"Ich kam der Stadt näher; *alle die alten Gartenhäuschen wurden von mir begrüsst*, die neuen waren mir zuwider, so auch alle Veränderungen, die man sonst vorgenommen hatte."

Goldsmith's returning wanderer refers in general to "the sheltered cot," and describes in particular that of the village preacher:—

Near yonder copse, where once the garden smiled,  
And still where many a garden flower grows wild;  
There, where a few torn shrubs the place disclose,  
The village preacher's modest mansion rose.

Fifthly, Werther's narrative of his visit to the home of his early years closes with an earnest remark concerning the *Vergänglichkeit* and the *Unwerth des Lebens*, which is in part a verbal rendering of two oft-quoted lines of Goldsmith. The hero's words are: "Der Mensch braucht nur wenige Erdschollen, um drauf zu geniessen, weniger, um drunter zu ruhen." Compare herewith:—

Then, pilgrim, turn, thy cares forego;  
All earth-born cares are wrong;  
Man wants but little here below,  
Nor wants that little long.

The stanza is from the ballad now known as the *Hermit*, formerly styled *Edwin and Angelina*, upon which Goethe based his *Erwin und Elmire*, published in 1775 in Jacobi's *Iris*—a proof that the ballad must at that time have been familiar to him. In the translation of the *Deserted Village*, he vied with his friend Gotter in Wetzlar in 1772, but was dissatisfied with his effort because of the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of preserving the *zarte Be-deutsamkeit* of the original. Werther's letter

of May 9, even unsupported by the testimony of DW., is in itself sufficient proof that Herder's young pupil was touched by the sweet melancholy of Goldsmith. In this letter Werther describes himself as a *Waller* to his earthly *Heimat*. In the next (Am 25. Mai), he tells of his *Grille* of going, like Goldsmith's wanderer George, into the army. In the one following this (Am 11. Julius), he writes of his intention "wieder in der Irre herumzuziehen." Then comes that of July 16, in which he exclaims: "Ja wohl bin ich ein Wanderer, ein Waller auf der Erde!" Here is no *Abgerissenheit*, but a perfectly logical sequence. The hero regards himself not only as a pilgrim to his heavenly home, but also as such when returning to his home on earth; and, in the latter case, the tender pathos of his story is due not a little to the influence of the kind-hearted, though unfortunate and impecunious, Irish poet, Oliver Goldsmith.

ROBERT FERGUSON.

New York.

OLD ENGLISH NOTES.

1. *Beowulf* 1408 ff.

THE passage in *Beowulf* descriptive of the abode of Grendel's mother, though much more elaborated, suggests a couple of lines in Seneca (*Herc. Fur.* 762-3):

Ferale tardis imminet saxum vadis,  
Stupent ubi undæ, segne torpescit fretum,

which has thus been translated by Dr. Ella I. Harris:

A savage cliff o'erhangs  
The stagnant shallows, where the waves move not,  
And where the lazy waters ever sleep.

Virgil's description of his infernal river (*Æn.* 6. 296-7):

Turbidus hic cæno vastaue voragine gurgis,  
Æstuat atque omnem Cocyto eructat harenam,

suggests the 'gedrēfed' of *Beow.* 1417. With these Virgil lines Harper and Miller, *Æneid*, compare Shelley, *Sensitive Plant* 3. 70-73:

Spawn, weeds, and filth, a leprous scum,  
Made the running rivulet thick and dumb,  
And at its outlet flags huge as stakes  
Dammed it up with roots knotted like water-snakes.

There can, of course, be no connection; but Shelley's 'water-snakes' suggest the 'wyrmy-cynnes fela' and 'sellice sǣdracan' of *Beow.* 1425-6. The whole context in Shelley should be compared; here, however, there is no overhanging cliff, as in *Beowulf* and Seneca. In the *Odyssey* (10. 515) 'there is a rock, and the

meeting of the two roaring waters; and, as we have the 'fyrgebeamas' the 'wynleasne wudu' of *Beowulf* (1413, 1416), so there are in the *Odyssey* (10. 509-510) 'the groves of Persephone, even tall poplar trees and willows that shed their fruit before the season,' even as the *Aeneid* has its 'forest gloom' (6. 238), and its 'elm, shadowy, vast, spreading out its boughs and aged arms (6. 282-3).' Dante (*Inf.* 3) helps us but little; his scene is quite different. Plato is not so wholly dissimilar (*Phaedo* 112, 113), with his 'lake . . . boiling with water and mud,' and his 'wild and savage region' near the Styx. We might also, in a general way, compare Catullus (17. 10-11):

Verum totius ut lacus putidæque paludis  
Lividissima maximeque est profunda vorago.

## 2. A CORRUPT WORD IN KING ALFRED'S *Soliloquies*.

In King Alfred's translation of the *Soliloquies* of Augustine (*Englische Studien* 18. 341<sup>1</sup>) occur these words:

'Swā-swā scypes ho feut, þonne þæt scyp ungetæslīcost on ancre rīt and sēo sǣ hrēohost byð, ðonne wōt hē gewiss smelte wedere tōwærd.'

In this *ho feut*, of course, makes no sense. Cockayne (*Shrine*, p. 205) says: 'Hofding, chief, captain, occurs in Chron. 1076, MS. Tiber. B. iv, and is probably meant here.' Hulme (*Die Sprache der Altenglischen Barbeitung der Soliloquien Augustins*, p. 58) proposes to read *hāsæta*, since *ō* occurs elsewhere in this text for OE. regular *ā*, and *f* and *s* are occasionally interchanged. Hulme remarks that there is nothing to correspond in the Latin, that Thomson translates by 'the ship's master,' and that Bosworth-Toller falsely render *hāsæta* by 'rower.' On this it is to be noted that Earle and Plummer translate by 'rower,' Hall by 'oarsman, rower,' and Sweet by 'rower in warship.'

I propose to read *hlāford*, basing the emendation upon the *scipes hlāford*, *sciphlaford*, of the Wright-Wülcker *Vocabularies*, 166. 6 and 181. 21, both translating *nauclerus*.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

<sup>1</sup> Since the above was written, Hargrove has silently adopted my emendation, which I suggested to him privately, in his edition (29. 20).

## ETYMOLOGIES.

*Cheap, cope, coup, kaupatjan, caupo, κάπηλος, etc.* I.

IN volume iii (p. 1379) of his dictionary Grimm suggested that *kaufen* was related to Gothic *kaupatjan* 'strike' and that the formal striking or shaking of the hands in sign of sealing a bargain was at the bottom of the change of the meaning from 'strike' to 'barter.' This position was assumed also by Weigand, Vigfusson, and others. It is interesting to read the treatment of the word in the various editions of Kluge's dictionary and to observe how from being at first an ardent advocate of the native origin of the word he has yielded step by step until he has removed from the sixth edition every trace of the fact that there are serious objections to the theory of the Latin origin. Skeat follows the earlier editions of Kluge and (see his *Concise Etymological Dictionary*, new edition, 1901) has not observed that he has abandoned his earlier position. Murray maintains a cautious attitude. In volume v. of the Grimm dictionary, Hildebrand associated the word with dialectic German *kauten* 'trade,' but added: "die sinnige ableitung J. Grimms von goth. *kaupatjan* könnte vielleicht daneben bestehen."

Those who abandon the association of Gothic *kaupōn* and *kaupatjan* have felt it incumbent upon them to explain *kaupatjan* and have been compelled to call various foreign languages to their aid. Kluge (first edition) derived it from Latin *colaphus* (see below), Bugge from Armenian *kop'em* 'dar delle busse' (see below and Uhlenbeck from a

"nominalstamm *kaupat* = *haubip*, der von einem nicht-germ. volke mit vorgerm. consonantismus zu den Goten oder deren vorfahren gekommen war"!

It is my desire to bring forward evidence in favor of the theory so briefly set forth by Grimm, and to explain the ultimate origin of the words.

In speaking of such correspondences as LG. *piwit*, *tiwit*, *kiwit*, Hildebrand (vol. v, pp. 5-6) says:—

"Diese erscheinung nun, eine uralte bewegung in den consonanten, welche die der lautverschiebung kreuzend durchschneidet, und während jene einem schritt vorwärts gleicht, einem sprung zur seite zu vergleichen ist, zeigt sich



im gebiet der deutschen sprachen besonders entwickelt im auslaut der stämme und wurzeln, sie ist geradezu ein wichtiger behelf bei der aus- und weiterbildung der wurzeln."

I need not refer to earlier expressions of this idea, or to the recent exploitations of it. I desire only to urge that words that are attempts at linguistic imitation of sounds must be taken and dealt with by themselves, and cannot be used to strengthen any theory as to other words. Thus in *clap clapper, clack clacker, clat clatter*, it will not do to say that we have a common root *cla-* with the various determinatives *p*, *k*, and *t*; we simply have three slightly different attempts to imitate by means of a group of speech-sounds the complex sound heard when two bodies strike each other, —just as we have others in *knack, knock, clock*, OHG. *klockōn*, Du. *kloppen* (Ger. *klopfen*), Greek *κολάπτω, κολάζω, κόλαφος*, Latin *colaphus*, etc. So, too, *sluck* and *slip*; *flip, flick, flutter*, and *flirt*; *tattle, cackle, prattle, chatter, chat, blatter blat, blab*, and a thousand others.

A large and important class of these words consists of attempts to imitate the sound of a blow or of the impact of one body upon another. These words fall into groups according to the character of the impacting bodies and resultant sounds. Thus *flap, huæppan, slap, spat, spank* belong together; as do also *thud, thump, bump, bunt*; and *swat, whap, swack, whack, thwack*, etc. Another group contains words consisting of a back vowel preceded by *k* or *ch* and followed by some voiceless consonant, usually a stop. Thus, without looking beyond English dialects, we have: *chap* or *chop* 'strike,' 'chop,' *cut* 'strike,' 'cut,' *cuff* 'strike,' *cool* 'a beating,' *cop* 'strike,' *cope* 'strike,' *coup* 'knock over'; not to mention *coop, cook, cuck, chuck*, all meaning to throw with force.

When, then, we find words like dialectic German *kauten* to 'swap' and *kaupen* to 'barter,' or 'buy,' if we can make it reasonably sure that they are derived from imitative words meaning, for example, to 'strike,' we are justified in associating them,—not as variant derivatives from a common root, as Hildebrand would have us do,—but as similar formations only.

It is not difficult to show that there are vari-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Armenian *hup'em*, which Bugge suggested as a source of Gothic *kaupatjan* (see above). Such imitative words occur in all languages, but they have no more derivative relation to one another than have the *oh's* and *ah's* of different languages.

ous words that have the two meanings 'strike' and 'barter.' First of all, we have Gothic *kaupōn* 'barter' and *kaup-at-jan* 'strike,' 'cuff.' Corresponding to *kaupōn* we have ON. *kaupa* 'buy,' 'barter,' but its preterit tense corresponds in form to the preterit of Gothic *kaupatjan*, not to that of *kaupōn* (cf. Vigfusson). Moreover, *kaupatjan* passed into Finnish as *kaupata*, and there has the meaning 'offer for sale.' A closer identification of two words could hardly be asked for.—English *chap* and *chop* mean (1) 'strike,' 'cut with a blow,' (2) 'buy,' 'barter.' It might be said that *chap* was abstracted from *chapman*, a normal development of OE. *ċeapman*; but this explanation cannot be resorted to in order to explain *chop* and is, therefore, probably not correct for *chap* either.—English *swap, swat, swack* mean to 'strike,' 'cut,' 'fall heavily,' and *swap* also means to 'barter,' 'exchange.'—German *kaufen* signifies to 'strike,' 'hack,' and MG. and LG. *kauten* has the meaning 'swap,' 'barter.'—English *rap* means to 'strike' and to 'exchange' or 'barter.'—Of English *cope, coup*, 'strike,' 'knock over,' 'barter,' I shall speak later.

It might be suggested that the idea 'strike' arose out of that of 'exchanging blows,' 'dealing out blows,' etc., and is, thus, secondary. We shall, however, see that several of the words for striking are imitative of the sound made by striking and, therefore, must have had the meaning 'strike' before they got that of 'barter,' 'buy,' etc. The idea of striking could develop into that of bartering in more than one way. First of all, one might imagine that ancient hucksters had a clapper (like that of the clapman, or public crier), as the modern huckster at times rings a bell. Then there is the hammer of the auctioneer. Grimm, as we have seen, suggested (Dictionary iii, p. 1379; cf. also *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, ii, index) the striking of hands in sealing a bargain; and my colleague Prof. Drake has called my attention to the Roman custom of striking a slave or other property with a spear, later a wand, in sign of ownership.<sup>2</sup> It would not be strange if more than one of these possibilities had been effective. For Grimm's theory there is, however, so much evidence that we must recognize it as explaining practically all the Germanic words involved in the present discussion.

<sup>2</sup> As Prof. Drake expects to investigate this matter farther, I forbear to deal with it.

Grimm (iii, p. 1379) referred to Ger. *kaufslagen* and ON. *slā kaupi*. We have also ON. *kaupslaga*, Du. *koopslagen*, Eng. *strike a bargain*, etc. It might be said that these terms all point to some connection between striking and bargaining, but that they do not prove that it was the striking together or shaking of hands that was referred to. Modern German and Modern English expressions, however, place this beyond all doubt. Compare the following German expressions taken from Sanders' dictionary.

*Einschlagen*='in die Hand schlagen,' namentlich in die dargereichte eines andern, besonders als Bekräftigung beim Abschluss eines Handels, Vertrags, einer Wette, etc.: "Er schlug ein: es gilt!" "Schlag ein! topp!" So too: "Die Hand einschlagen" and "Mit der Hand einschlagen," z. B. in die dargebotene des andern. In the light of this, compare: "Der Kauf ward eingeschlagen"='durch Einschlagen der Hand abgeschlossen. — *Anschlagen*='etwas mit Handschlag, etc., abschliessen,' z. B. "Eine Wette anschlagen," "Einen Kauf mit jemand anschlagen;" auch='verkaufen.'—Compare also *Schlag* 'price.' But *losschlagen* ("Etwas um einen bestimmten Preis losschlagen," etc.) probably arose at auctions, as *zuschlagen* and English *knock off* certainly did. Other similar uses of *schlagen* and its compounds are of uncertain origin.

In English it was formerly customary, and locally is still customary, to say *to strike hands*, both in the sense of 'to shake hands' and in that of 'to conclude an agreement or bargain.' Similarly there is the archaic expression "*Strike me luck*," said by one of the parties to a bargain as he extended his hand to the other. Balancing accounts was formerly spoken of as *striking*.—But even our present expression *to shake hands* has undergone the same development. Thus we say "*to shake hands on it*"='to shake hands in sign of binding an agreement.' To some extent *to shake* was, and in slang is still, used without the word *hands*, cf. "First, Marcus Brutus, will I shake with you," *Julius Caesar*, iii, 1. 185; and so in slang: "Will you shake on that?" In southern England *shake* has actually got the meaning 'bargain,' for example, "*That's a fair shake*"='That's a fair bargain.' We may, then, regard the development of the idea 'bargain,' 'barter,' etc., out of that of 'strike' as settled beyond all question and we have no reason to doubt that, at least

in the great majority of cases, the development arose out of the custom of shaking hands in sign of binding a bargain.

In a subsequent paper I shall consider in detail the words involved.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

#### NOTES ON THE CÆDMONIAN EXODUS.

SINCE the publication of the second half of the second volume of the Grein-Wülker *Bibliothek*, in 1894, the difficult text of the *Exodus* has received attention at the hands chiefly of Holthausen (*Anglia*, Beiblatt v, 231), Graz (*Die Metrik der sog. Cædmonschen Dichtungen mit Berücksichtigung der Verfasserfrage*, Weimar, 1894; and "Beiträge zur Textkritik der sogenannten Cædmonschen Dichtungen," *Englische Studien* xxi, 1 f.), Cosijn (*Beiträge* xix, 457 f.), and Mürkens "Untersuchungen über das altenglische Exoduslied" (*Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik*, Heft ii, Bonn, 1899, p. 62 f.).

22-34. Mürkens (p. 69) refers to the historic event recorded in *Ex.* iii, 11-25; the poet's specific expression in ll. 27-29 appears, however, to stand in closer relation with *Ex.* vi, 3: 'but by my name' Jehovah I was not known to them.'

47. The tradition to which Holthausen refers has scriptural basis in *Numbers* xxxiii, 4: 'upon their gods also the Lord executed judgments.'

62. Mürkens (p. 88) adopts the reading *meorringa* (for MS. *meoringa*), and would see in it the Anglian equivalent (*eo* for *ea*, and absence of umlaut) of \**mearringa*. This is correct. The verb *mirran*, *mierran* is represented in the Goth. *marzjan* (see also MOD. LANG. NOTES xvi, 153), and the noun in *-ing* should agree in vocalism with the denominative verb (Kluge, *Nominale Stammbildungslehre*, §159). The metre is now restored (see *Beiträge* x, 505). In construction, contrary to the interpretation given by Grein and Toller, *meorringa* as gen. pl. limits *fela*, which is an acc. governed by *ofer*. The *pā* of line 61 is adverbial: 'Moses then led the host over many obstacles.'

70-92. Mürkens has overlooked *Ps.* 105, 39: 'He spread a cloud for a covering; and fire to give light in the night.' Compare also *Isaiah* 4, 5.

108. *Heofonbēacen āstāh  
 æfenna gehwām, oðer wundor,  
 syllic, æfter sunne setlrade behēold,  
 ofer lēodwerum līge scīnan,  
 byrnende bēam.*

Cosijn reasons ineffectually against the expression so admirably paralleled in *Ps.* 103. 18, *Sunne hire setlgang healdep: sol cognovit occasum suum*, and Kluge violently destroys both grammar and style by putting *setlrade behēold* beyond the reach of its subject. After correcting *sunnan* of the MS. (occasioned by *æfter*) to *sunne*, the entire passage, as now punctuated, appears to be altogether satisfactory. It will be observed that March (*Anglo-Saxon Reader*, p. 87) has done his utmost to construe the imperfect text.

115. *hār hēðstapa*. This reading, suggested by Rieger (*Verskunst* p. 46; cf. *Beowulf* 103, *mære mearcstapa*), is indirectly confirmed by that connection of thought and phrase which led Groth (*Composition und Alter der . . . Exodus*, Berlin, 1883, p. 31) to recall *Beowulf* 103 while commenting on line 61. Cosijn cites only the conjectured *hāres hādes* (Sievers), and then offers *hār hēðbroga*, an uncalled for substitute for *hēðstapa*. It may be presumed that a recollection of Rieger's emendation would have both restrained Cosijn from offering another, and proved an advantage to Graz (see *Beiträge* xx, 553). Holthausen, with his usual attention to completeness, has not overlooked Rieger.

145. Read *ymbe ānwig*.

147. Read *wære bræcon* (MS. *fræton*).

148-153. 'Floods of rage filled the heart (of the Egyptians), and mighty passions of men; in violation of compacts (*mānum trēowum*) and maliciously (*fācne*) they would requite that life-value, so that he (Moses) would have bought for his people that day's deed with blood, had the mighty God granted them (the Egyptians) success in that hostile expedition.'

162. Read *hilde grædige* [*hræfn ūppe got*]. This is in accordance with *Elene* 52-53, *hresen ūppe gōl, wan and wælfel*, which also gives the desired confirmation of the singular *wonn wælcæsege*.

186. Read *on pæs ēades riht* (cf. 338-339 and 353-354).

203. *tō pām mægenheapum*. Cancel *tō*, and construe the resulting dat. instr. as referring to the Egyptians.

283. Read *wæter in wealfæsten* (cf. 296: *in randgebeorh*).

305. Read [*him ȝða weall*].

334. Read *fēða mōdgode* (cf. 312: *Jūdisc fēða*).

349. Read *mægenprymma mæst* (cf. 550).

350. Read *folc æfter folce*.

487. *helpendra pað*, read *hwelpendra pað*, 'the path of the sea-dogs, or sea-monsters' = 'the sea.' Compare *hwelp* and the Germanic \**hwelpa* (Uhlenbeck, *Beiträge* xxvi, 311) and *Seefahrer* 21, *huilpa* (Hönncher, *Anglia* ix, 446). The participial noun of agency \**hwelpend*, here assumed as a generic name for sea-monsters, requires the construction of the verb \**hwelpan* 'to toss, to plunge.'

491. *Witrod*, read *Wigrād* (cf. *Gen.* 2084, *wigrōde* for *wigrāde*, Cosijn, *Beiträge* viii, 570). This reading is suggested by Toller s. v. *wig-trod*, but see also Dietrich *H. Z.* x, 353.

498. MS. *on bogum*, Edd. *onbugon*, read *onbrugdon* (or *onbrūdon*; cf. 222), and construe transitively with *brūne ȝppinge* as subject, and *hie* as object: 'after the brown floods struck them.' Metrically the line is exceptional with *onbugon* (*Beiträge* x, 454).

504-506. *gescēadan* is the reduplicating verb recorded in Sievers § 395 *Ann.* 4, 'to separate, discern, decide, decree, deal out,' but Grein's translation of *wolde . . . hilde gescēadan*, 'den Heerkampf wolte scheiden' is incorrect. The true meaning (as in *Maldon* 33, *hilde dælon*) is 'he wished to deal out warfare.' In the following sentence the past participle of the same verb occurs in the weak form, *wearð . . . gescēod*. This form is supported by the weak preterite *gescēode* in *Daniel* 620. Moreover, we may now accept the conjectured weak pret. *scēode* for *Exodus* 586, with the additional advantage of retaining the pronominal subject *hēo*, which the editors have wrongly changed into *heom*. The verb in *Genesis* 1103, and *Daniel* 266, cited in the B.-T. Dictionary, s. v. *scēon*, does not belong here.

A parallel group of forms may be noticed in the case of the verb *sceððan* (Sievers § 392 *Ann.* 6): *Exodus* 488, pret. *gescēod* (cf. *Phoenix* 400, *gescōd*); *Andreas* 18, weak pret. *gescēode*.

The verb *scēon* (*ge-scēon*), first suggested by Dietrich (*H. Z.* x, 320) and since then kept alive in the dictionaries, may, therefore, I believe, be confidently cancelled.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.



## ARTHURIAN LITERATURE.

*King Arthur in Cornwall*, by W. H. DICKINSON. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1900.

So much has been written within recent years on the origin and development of the Arthurian legend that there is scarce a recess of the subject which remains unexplored. The writer who attempts to treat any phase of it to-day is thus sore beset by the bulk of his materials. Perhaps his most difficult task is to do justice to these materials, to sift the grain from the chaff and to take proper account of the results which his predecessors have secured. The value of the present investigation could undoubtedly have been increased, if the author had kept this fact in mind. One cannot help regretting that Mr. Dickinson has no knowledge of the French localization of the Arthurian legend<sup>1</sup> (however untrustworthy he may have considered evidence drawn from this source), and Zimmer's *Nennius Vindictus*,<sup>2</sup> with which he is apparently unacquainted, is surely too important a work to be overlooked in any discussion of the personality of Arthur. Apart from these limitations, however, the present inquiry is an exceedingly clear and dignified piece of work, which gains in importance when viewed in the light which modern research has thrown on the history of other Celtic heroes, notably Tristan.<sup>3</sup>

In general, the work may be described as an independent attempt to lay bare the roots which underlie the main branch of Arthurian literature. To attain this end the author purposely leaves aside everything "obviously fictitious," and gives his sole attention to geographical and historical records. By way of introduction he humorously remarks that "only the Devil is more often mentioned in local association than Arthur." But while the British hero's name is thus widely known in this respect, no written record of him has been handed down from his own time or place.

Considering first the topographical side of his subject, Mr. Dickinson distinguishes four groups of Arthurian "localities": 1. North Cornwall, from Boscastle to Wadebridge, embracing such well-known sites as Tintagel, Damelioc, Kelly-Rounds (Kelliwic); 2. Brittany, which he mentions only by name; 3. South Wales, with Cærlleon-upon-Usk, the

City of Legions (so-named after the Second Augustan) as a center; 4. the "borderland" between England and Scotland, extending from Carlisle as far north as Edinburgh. Names alluding to Arthur, directly or indirectly, are plentiful throughout all these districts, but in the last-named region, in the north of Great Britain, they are most numerous. The last fact is the basis of the hypothesis that Scotland is the "historical birthplace of Arthurian tradition."<sup>4</sup> Though Mr. Dickinson cannot be called an advocate of this view, he nevertheless believes—as will presently appear—that the North was the scene of several of Arthur's exploits and probably of his death. On the other hand, he frankly admits that compared to the other districts there are but few legendary details connecting Scotland with Arthur, which, moreover, are by no means reliable.

As regards the earliest written records we have of Arthur, he points out that these are practically limited to the literature of Wales. The *Triads*, which are held to contain materials dating from the sixth century, frequently refer to Arthur. One of these compositions<sup>5</sup> states that he was "chief lord at Kelliwic in Cornwall." Other Welsh records connect him with the same locality. In a poem on Geraint,<sup>6</sup> he is mentioned as fighting also at Llongborth, which Mr. Dickinson interprets as Portsmouth, where an engagement between Cerdic and Arthur probably occurred. Taliessin, the most famous of Welsh bards, gives Arthur the title of *Gudelig*; that is, ruler, and constantly alludes to him in terms of great admiration. Further references might be cited, but these are sufficient to show the author's reasons for believing that these traditions have reference to a genuine local hero. Whatever doubts there may be as to the precise date of the *Triads*, to the Welsh bards Arthur was a soldier of great activity, who was engaged in a number of fights, one of which was at Kelliwic, a stronghold of historic record. Thus we have ample reason to believe that the West, including a part of Wales and certainly Cornwall, had a chieftain called Arthur who had won fame as a warrior:—this fact must be given due weight as against the negative evidence of other sources.

<sup>4</sup> The view of Stuart Glennie.

<sup>5</sup> *Triads of Arthur and His Warriors*; cf. Skene, *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, vol. ii, p. 457.

<sup>6</sup> Black Book of Cærmarchen.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Berlin, 1893; cf. below.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Golther, *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, 1900, pp. 1-3.

The period from the sixth to the ninth century is a blank with respect to records of the king. The histories of Gildas and Bede do not once mention his name, though they describe battles in which later ages have given him a place. The omission is particularly striking on the part of Gildas, who lived in Glastonbury, a place rich in Arthur lore, and who was twenty-two years of age at the time assigned by tradition to Arthur's death. The Saxon Chronicle also—though of somewhat later date—has not a word on Arthur. The supposition is, therefore, inadmissible that Arthur was in any sense as important a figure in British history as either Vortigern or Ambrosius, for if he had been like the latter, commander-in-chief of the British forces, or like the former, King of Britain, the fact would surely have been mentioned by the historians of the period. As was said above, Arthur probably held sway over a limited territory in the West, but his concern with the East, the so-called "Saxon Shore," must have been slight, if such a connection is to be granted at all.

Thus far it is possible to accept Mr. Dickinson's conclusions in full. The above views have, since their appearance, been independently borne out by the best of authorities,<sup>7</sup> on the testimony of additional written documents. The remainder of the book, however, gives evidence of the writer's deficiency in reading to which we alluded above, and here his estimates are accordingly less secure. By the time of Nennius (ninth century) the "legend" of Arthur had taken tangible shape. Of the twelve battles in which this writer claims Arthur was engaged, one alone, that of Badon Hill, stands out as an indubitable historic fact. The date of this battle is 520, and Badon Hill is generally located in the South, as Cerdic is supposed to have opposed Arthur on this occasion, and we have no evidence that Cerdic ever went North. But the "last weird battle," that of Camlan, in which Romance lets Arthur meet his death, is not among the engagements enumerated by Nennius. It has, however, been given such prominence by Geoffrey of Monmouth and the romancers who follow in his train, that the question of its possible occurrence and location is full of interest.

If we admit the reality of Camlan, there are two localities to either of which it may be as-

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Romania*, xxx, p. 1 ff. (F. Lot).

signed. We may simply accept the statement of Geoffrey that it took place on the Camel, near Camelford (Cornwall), where it is certain another battle having no connection with Arthur occurred in 832; or we may suppose that it was waged in Scotland, as Skene<sup>8</sup> and Stuart Glennie<sup>9</sup> maintain, in the valley of the Firth of Forth, and that this Scotch battle later became confused with the ninth century combat in the South. Mr. Dickinson presents the following reasons in favor of accepting the latter view.

Scotch tradition, which is in part supported by the "Chronicle of the Scots," represents Arthur opposed on the Firth of Forth by Modred, King of Scotland; in this engagement Arthur is defeated and slain. Even Geoffrey of Monmouth,<sup>10</sup> who places the battle on the banks of the Camel, states that Modred's force consisted of Picts and Scots. Now, says Mr. Dickinson, "it is improbable that Arthur could have been confronted in Cornwall by a great army of northern savages." But Geoffrey goes on to say that immediately after the defeat Arthur was conveyed to Glastonbury, where it is supposed he died and was buried. As the question of Arthur's last battle has thus been linked with that of his final resting place, the Glastonbury story demands consideration. For it is evident, since Glastonbury is in the South, that if Arthur concluded his career in Scotland we cannot assume that he was buried in Glastonbury. Inversely, the author argues, if the Glastonbury story can be maintained, we may agree with Geoffrey that Camlan was fought in Cornwall. Considerable space<sup>11</sup> is now devoted to an examination of the last question. Mr. Dickinson adduces excellent reasons, into which we cannot enter here, to show that the testimony which some writers have accepted in favor of Glastonbury as the place of Arthur's burial is entirely *ex post facto*, being devised years after Arthur's death to meet the demands of a well-established legend.

However true the above statements may be, they do not, as Mr. Dickinson seems to believe, prove that Camlan took place in Scotland; they do not even disprove the contrary, that the battle occurred in the South. In reality

<sup>8</sup> Skene, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 60.

<sup>9</sup> Glennie, *Arthurian Scotland*, Merlin. Early English Text Society, part iii, p. lxi.

<sup>10</sup> *Historia regum Britanniae*: cf. J. A. Giles, *Six Old English Chronicles*, Bohn ed.

<sup>11</sup> Pp. 34-48.

they show only that the Glastonbury legend may in the future be dissociated from the accounts of Arthur's last battle. As to the supposed location of the latter we have better grounds, perhaps, in spite of the above arguments, to place it in Cornwall than in the far North. The name of Gorlois and Modred have for some time been recognized to be of Cornish origin.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, Prof. Zimmer<sup>13</sup> has shown beyond reasonable doubt that when the Irish founded the Kingdom of Scotland in the third and fourth centuries they also landed in South Wales and established Demetia, which included Cornwall. When in the fifth century the Saxons attacked the British in Wales the latter turned on their Irish neighbors, then called "Scots," and subjugated them. This contest probably occurred long before Arthur's date, but it is quite possible that a memory of it has survived in the romantic accounts of his life, especially those which have made Camlan so famous.

Mr. Dickinson's inquiry concludes with an attempt to determine more precisely than has yet been done the location of several Cornish strongholds which legend connects with Arthur's career. His discussion of Tintagel and Kelliwic is very interesting and instructive. Caradigan, however, which together with Mr. Phillimore he identifies with Cardinham, is rather Cardigan, as M. Lot has recently pointed out.<sup>14</sup>

WM. A. NITZE.

Columbia University.

#### ENGLISH PROSODY.

*An Introduction to the Scientific Study of Poetry; being Prolegomena to a Science of English Prosody*, by MARK H. LIDDELL. Doubleday, Page, & Co. New York: 1902. Pp. xvi+312. \$1.25.

THE science of English prosody is confessedly in so unsatisfactory a condition that any serious attempt to establish its theories or explain its facts deserves respectful attention. Prof. Liddell begins his attempt by criticising various inadequate notions of poetry. We are told, he says (p. 5), that

"poetry is a thing of God;" that it is "the finer spirit of knowledge;" that it is "something divine;" that it is the "opposition of

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Rhys, *Arthurian Legend*, Oxford, 1891, p. 392; Loth, *Études celtiques*, in *Revue celtique*, 1898, p. 404, note 3.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 84-93; also Kuno Meyer, *Early relations between Gael and Brython*, in *Transactions of the Society of Cymmrodorion*, 1895-1896, pp. 55-86.

<sup>14</sup> *Romania*, xxx, p. 19.

science;" that it is "the completest expression of humanity;" that it is the "language of ideality;" that it is the "expression of the inner motions of the soul."

These notions are lamentably current, we must admit; but for the most part they are men of straw, ideas not set forth in textbooks on poetics, and certainly more illogical in their phrasing than in the ideas they stand for. Here, however, is what Prof. Liddell offers as a substitute:

"Poetry is literature, usually of a high degree of Human Interest, which, in addition to its Human Interest, has in it an added Æsthetic Interest due to the arrangement of some easily recognizable and constantly present concomitant of thought-formulation into a form of æsthetic appeal for which an appreciative Æsthetic Sentiment has been gradually developed in the minds of those who habitually think by means of the language in which the poetry is written."

As the sub-title shows, a science of English prosody, rather than poetics, is the aim of the book. Here, too, Prof. Liddell begins by ridiculing our use of the classic names. To him, an English "iambic pentameter" is distressing, a "monometer" monstrous (p. 168). It must be admitted, I suppose, that to one who knows only (and only a little) of classic prosody, these terms would be misleading; but I do not know of a single writer on prosody (since Shakspeare's day) who does not at once explain that, though the names are the same, the things meant are different. Lamentable as the original adoption of the terms may be, they are ineradicably present in the literature of English prosody for the past three hundred years, and if, as Prof. Liddell insists (pp. 21, 310, *et al.*), our study of prosody must be historical, the student cannot evade them. Moreover, in these three hundred years, these terms have acquired English citizenship and have fairly taken their place along with a multitude of others, equally illogical but now in established good usage. We have substituted a little, for we often call the ballad measure "four-beat," say "pause" instead of cæsura, and "unstressed foot" instead of pyrrhic. But it seems quite unlikely, at least, that "iambic pentameter" will soon be replaced by Prof. Liddell's "five-wave rising rhythm."

The classic notation of  $\cup$  -, is, to be sure, absurd, and perhaps inevitably misleading. But it is not the only notation current; Schipper and Gummere mark stressed syllables with an accent-mark, Ellis and Mayor use *o*, *1*, *2*, *ac*-



cording to the relative emphasis of the syllables, Lanier uses the musical notation, and Corson marks unstressed syllables with an *x* and stressed ones with an *a*. The current authorities seem, therefore, not to be misled by the classic prosody, and have given us our choice of at least four notations which, however wrong they may be in what they represent, are not misleading. To none of these does Prof. Liddell pay any attention.

The preface (p. ix) declares that "the treatment of the subject has been made as simple and as practical as possible." The definition of poetry we have already quoted. As nearly as the reviewer can make out, the argument is this:

Our ideas tend to express themselves not only in words but in word groups, which have fixed modulations of emphasis or stress. For example, the phrase "the power of God" is not merely a word group expressing a definite idea; its order is fixed, for "the of God power" is by no means the same thing to us. We cannot alter the stresses; for to read "the power of God" is to change it into something else. These units are called "thought moments."

The tendency of such thought moments, in material which possesses Human Interest, is to arrange themselves in some sort of rhythmic order, in which the rhythms may be "punctuated" by alliteration, rime, or accent. Our English verse punctuation system is based upon stress (which is discriminated in some obscure esoteric way from accent). The stress, which he calls "attention-stress," is of three kinds, word-stress, sentence-stress, and emotion-stress. The first two kinds seem fairly intelligible; by emotion-stress he means "a stress of attention due to the peculiar emotional interest which a notion may have in virtue of its relation to a recalled personal experience" (p. 197).

These stresses admit of various arrangements, so that we have the following summary of the principles of English verse form:

"English rhythms run either in rising or falling series of successive rhythm waves. In rising rhythms the even impulse is differentiated from the preceding odd impulse by receiving a greater amount of attention stress.

In rising rhythm a thought-moment may begin with a falling wave-group; or, in other words, a series in rising rhythm may be reversed for two impulses at the beginning of a new thought-moment.

Corollary: Full stressed impulses do not occur in the odd numbered places of rising rhythm, except in the case of 'reversal', nor in the even numbered places of falling rhythm.

Secondarily stressed impulses may occur in any position in the verse."

In the above principles, he allows for a trochee only in the first foot of iambic measures; although we have them most frequently in the first foot, they may and do occur anywhere. The Corollary does not allow for either spondees or hovering accents, that is, for two equally stressed syllables together forming a "wave" or foot. It does not allow for a "wave" in which neither syllable has a logical stress, that is, an unstressed or pyrrhic foot.<sup>1</sup> In short, in many rather important instances, the book is wrong as to the facts of English verse, and in most cases, as the quotations show, is not simple and clear in its statements, but woefully obscure and well nigh unintelligible.

EDWARD P. MORTON.

Indiana University.

#### GOETHE.

*Goethe über seine Dichtungen*, Versuch einer Sammlung aller Aeusserungen des Dichters über seine poetischen Werke. Von Dr. HANS GERHARD GRAEF. Erster Theil: Die Epischen Dichtungen. Zweiter Band. Frankfurt a/M.: Literarische Anstalt, Rütten & Loening, 1902. 8vo, iv+697 pp.

GRAEF's monumental work on Goethe, the first part of which has now been completed by the appearance of the second volume, is easily the most helpful aid in the field towards a thorough study and an intelligent appreciation of the poet. It does not merely give us in their chronological order Goethe's own utterances concerning each of his works, but it supplements these by the most important remarks of his friends and critics and adds a more or less elaborate comment wherever it has seemed necessary to do so. We thus are made to assist, as it were, at the very genesis of the poet's works and are taught how to look upon them correctly by being informed how the poet himself viewed them and how he wished or did not wish them to be viewed by others. To be sure, some Goethe specialists may think much space might have been saved by merely citing instead of giving in full the many pages taken

<sup>1</sup> The reviewer's positive statements concerning substitution of feet and his failure to distinguish rhythmic stress from logical stress will not be universally accepted as satisfactory. J. W. B.

from such easily accessible books as *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, or the Correspondence between Goethe and Schiller, and, on the other hand, some Goethe enthusiasts whose private libraries are not all they desire, may sometimes wish for a quotation in full when they find but a reference, or for a detailed comment where they are offered only a short one or none at all. Nevertheless, all things duly considered, the author seems to have solved the difficult task of satisfying both the specialist and the enthusiast at the same time with remarkable tact and good judgment.

Volume Two contains pages 493-1189 of Part One and completes the treatment of the epic works. While Volume One, which together with the general plan of Gräfs work was briefly noticed in these columns, Vol. xvi, p. 182 f., apart from introductory matters comprises no less than twenty-three works, Volume Two, though considerably larger in number of pages, brings besides a few minor items additions and corrections and two indexes, only *Werther* and *Wilhelm Meister*. The four hundred pages devoted to *Wilhelm Meister* show especially the influence which Schiller and his friends by their appreciative remarks and reflections exercised upon the artistic and philosophic development of the *Lehrjahre*; the two hundred pages which deal with *Werther* remind us above all that the poet of *Faust* for almost a generation was preëminently the poet of *Werther* and that in a certain manner *Werther* remained his lifelong companion. We see the genesis of *Werther*, the impression it created among the poet's friends and in the world in general, the changes introduced in the edition of 1787, admirably summed up on pp. 554-556, the interesting, ludicrous or even provoking meetings between the author and foreigners in Italy and Germany, and in addition to this the enthusiastic letter from the writer of another *Werther* on an island on the Southern hemisphere, the famous interview with Napoleon at Erfurt in 1808, and, finally, the connection of *Werther* with Goethe's last gaet affection and the Marienbad elegy. Among all these things the subject of the meeting with Napoleon is made the basis of special study, the problem it offers to the literary critic is duly set forth, and an attempt is made to reconcile the various conflicting accounts and utterances by assuming that Napoleon censured

both the introduction of the motive of wounded ambition and the circumstance that *Werther* does not make any attempt to win Lotte while she is not yet married to Albert.

The additions and corrections (pp. 1085-1107) are mainly derived from material published since Volume One went to press. The first part of the two indexes is an index of the epic works. Each of the twenty-five works is taken up separately, and all matters pertaining to it are grouped under the nine headings of sources, places, letters, diaries, conversations, genesis, prints, influence, and details. The second index (pp. 1164-1189) is an index of persons and places. Not only the time and position of the persons is given, but also the nature of their relations to Goethe and the beginning of their acquaintance with him are indicated. The apparent intricacy of the first index is obviated by the detailed explanations and instructions which precede it; both indexes very materially enhance the value of the two volumes as books of reference. The typography shows great care and misprints appear to be very few and of no consequence. The comments of the author on utterances of Goethe and others are scarcely ever open to doubt, and when they are, the reader is always placed in the position to judge for himself.

We can, therefore, but repeat and still more emphasize the assurances of grateful obligation to the author which we expressed when noticing Volume One and we earnestly hope that, after he has so successfully completed his guide to a proper study and enjoyment of the epic works of Goethe, he may at no very distant date find strength and leisure to perform the same signal service with regard to the dramatic and lyric works.

A. GERBER.

Earlham College.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

##### I.

*Der Talisman*. Dramatisches Märchen in vier Aufzügen, von LUDWIG FULDA. Edited with Introduction and Notes by C. WILLIAM PRETTYMAN, Ph.D., Professor of German in Dickinson College. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co, 1902.

AN edition of Ludwig Fulda's *Der Talisman* without one word as to its keen political satire, its embodiment of one of the oldest Germanic

tales, and its great literary significance! Verily this is as good as the proverbial performance of *Hamlet* with the title rôle omitted for sake of brevity. Did the editor think that Fulda had no reason for changing the lazy old monarch lolling about at his ease, the Roi d'Yvetot of Andersen's fairy story, into a fiery young king raging around like a madman and claiming himself a god? Who else than Kaiser Wilhelm II can be intended (rightly or wrongly) by this tyrannical young despot, who says that he is the light and his people the dark, he the day and they the night; who deems the Almighty alone his peer? And the noble old Chancellor who has just been dismissed because he frankly said he could not see the bright halo which sycophant courtiers have persuaded the king ever burns about his head,—who else can be meant but Bismarck? If this was not apparent to the editor at first sight, he might have gained some very valuable suggestions from Spielhagen's excellent essay on "Ludwig Fulda's *Talisman*" in the *Magazin für Litteratur*, 62, p. 85 (1893), afterwards reprinted in Spielhagen's important *Epik und Dramatik*, xii (p. 263). Some valuable information might also have been obtained from the following articles, which the editor evidently did not consult: *Magazin für Litteratur*, 64, p. 1418: Velhagen and Klasing's *Monatshefte*, xiii, p. 9; *Deutsche Dichtung*, xv, p. 249; *Universum*, xiii, p. 276; *Hamburger Correspondent*, 1897, (Beilage 5-6); *Illustrierte Zeitung*, cii, p. 87; *Westminster Review*, cxli, p. 589. Other minor articles given in the *Jahresberichte für Literaturgeschichte* might also have been consulted to advantage. A review such as this is not the place to elucidate all the political satire in the drama under discussion. One or two examples must suffice: to those who know the German hatred of the French the following is intelligible enough. Omar says of his father, the banished chancellor,—

"Und Gandolin, der nie geschont sein Blut,  
Der in dem Kampfe mit den Heiden einst  
Unberwindlich war geblieben."—239.

and this man ("ein wackrer Mann und kühner Streiter.—Sein tapfres Herz war ohne Falsch und List") is dismissed for the reason already given. Can there be any doubt as to the satire? In the great procession scene on the anniversary of the coronation the whole populace is divided as to the color of the king's suit into two political parties, *Rechts und Links*, conservatives (*Die rechte Gruppe*) and liberals (*Die linke Gruppe*). When the cry goes up

finally from the liberals, could the satire be clearer?

BENEDICT [Leader of the Liberals—*links*]

Der König hat nichts an.

VIELE (noch gedämpft).

Der König hat nichts an!

(Wachsende Anfreugung im Volk, von Benedict und Balduin geschürt.)

ANSELM [Leader of the Conservatives—*rechts*]

Hört nur die Frechen!

GUIDO (halblaut zu Anselm).

Sie haben diesmal guten Grund.

ANSELM.

Ganz einerlei; wir müssen widersprechen. (1710 ff.)

There was a very general smile over the audience at the first Leipzig performance in 1893 at the line which plays upon the popularly accredited vanity of the Emperor: Rita after her naïve remark—"auch in Unterhosen"—says to the king,—

An dich zu Glauben ist Gesetz und Pflicht:

Ich glaube, dass du Kleider hast in Massen,—(1800ff.)

and when the king feels he is losing control he calls upon those around him to help:—

Mich wieder Herr, mich wieder Gott zu fühlen. (2149)

Whether this satire be true or false is of no importance, but it is safe to say that not since the days in which Aristophanes so mercilessly and so fearlessly lashed the demagogue Cleon and his political tyranny in *The Knights* and *The Wasps* has a dramatic author dared to present such keen political satire to the public as Fulda has done in *Der Talisman*.

The editor naively prints Andersen's charming fairytale, *Des Kaisers neue Kleider* as the old fable referred to by Fulda in the words "mit teilweiser Benutzung eines alten Fabelstoffes." Andersen died in 1875! Of course Fulda used Andersen's tale, but the story itself is almost world-old, coming probably from some such collection as the *Pantschantastra* or the *Hitopadesa*. As Spielhagen says (*Neue Beiträge zur Theorie und Technik der Epik und Dramatik*, p. 226):

"Seines alten, uralten Märchenthemas. Ich will hier nicht mit fremder Gelehrsamkeit prunken und den Leser mit der geschichte der Metamorphosen behelligen, welche das Thema durchgemacht hat, bis es von seiner indischen Heimat in Ludwig Fuldas Hände gelangte. Es ist ihm ergangen, wie jenem weltberühmten von den drei Ringen, auch insofern, als es das Glück hatte, auf seiner langen Wanderschaft endlich zu einem zu kommen, der den Wert des Kleinods voll zu schätzen wusste und die meisterliche Kunst besass, ihm eine seines Wertes würdige Fassung zu geben. Dieser Ruhm wird Ludwig Fulda bleiben, und er ist wahrlich kein geringer."



So, just as Lessing gave to the old story of the three rings its final artistic setting, has Fulda given final form to an indigenous Germanic fable. The original Hindu, or perhaps Oriental, source has not as yet been found. The story first appears in German literature about 1239 in *Der Pfaffe Ämte*. At the time when the *Volksepos* and the *Kunstepik* were on the decline, the *Novelle* became popular: it degenerated later into the *Schwank*. The crusaders brought back many such stories which were transmitted orally at first, no doubt. Large collections were afterwards made, such as the *Disciplina Clericalis*, *Gesta Romanorum*, *Liber Facietiarum*, *Dialogus Miraculorum*, etc. Many were incorporated in the French *Fabliaux*.

*Der Pfaffe Ämte* by *Der Stricker* is oriental in form and content. The third tale is called *Das unsichtbare Gemälde*. (*Erzählungen und Schwänke*, ed. by Lambel, Leipzig, 1872 = *Deutsche Classiker des Mittelalters*, xii, p. 36). At Paris the Pfaffe Ämte pretends to paint for the king a picture which only legitimately born people can see,—

die sehent ez unt niemen mē.  
die niht sint kōmen von der ē  
die sehent es einen stich niht.

The king gives him a large hall to paint and much money for materials. No one is to enter until all is done in six weeks. At the end of that time Ämte takes the king in first to explain all to him. He sees nothing, but is terrified and claims to see all clearly. The knights come and all swear they see it. Ämte departs richly paid. The queen comes with her ladies: all profess to see it. Then the Knechte come likewise, but,—

Sus sprach ein tumber dā bi:  
"ich'n weiz, was kindes ich si:  
ob ich joch vater nie gewan,  
hie ist niht gemälet an."

Then the common people, knights and finally the king agree with him.

In *Till Eulenspiegel*, "Die xxvii histori sagt wie Ulenspiegel dem landgroffen von Hessen malet, und in weisz macht, wer unelich wer der künt es nit sehen." (*Till Eulenspiegel*. Abdruck der Ausgabe vom Jahre 1515. *Neudrucke deutscher Litteraturwerke des xvi und xvii Jahrhunderts*, No. 55 u. 56; p. 38.) It is practically the same story localized on the Landgraf von Hessen at Marburg. Here it is one of the queen's maidens, a *toerin*, who can not see the painting. Then all cry out that

there is no painting there: Till has, of course, decamped in the meanwhile. The story, no doubt, is to be found in other *Schwankbücher*.

The form, however, in which Fulda used his tale is neither that of the *Pfaffe Ämte* nor of *Till Eulenspiegel*, but is first found on European soil in *El Conde Lucanor* (*Libro de Patronio*) of the Infanta Don Juan Manuel; Enxemplo xxxii; "De lo que contesció á un rey con los burladores que ficiéron el paño." (*Biblioteca de Autores Españoles: Escritores en Prosa Anteriores Al Siglo xv.*, Madrid, 1884, p. 402). Three rogues tell a king they can make cloth which only the legitimately born can see. He gives them a room to work in and much gold, silver, and silk. They pretend to weave. The king sends a courtier to inspect the cloth, who sees nothing, for there is nothing there, but dare not say so. Others come and claim to see the cloth clearly. So too the king, whom his courtiers persuade to have a suit made of the cloth and to wear it at the coming festival. This he does; all acclaim the beautiful suit except a negro groom, who naively says,—"por ende digovos que só cierto que vos desnudo ides." Then all cry out the king has nothing on: the rogues in the meantime have escaped. Manuel probably got his story by oral tradition from the Moors. Nevertheless the form of the *Conde Lucanor* is like that of the *Pantschatantra*. Indeed, the moral of this tale,—

Quien te conseja encobrir de tus amigos  
Quiere te engañar mas que tus enemigos.

resembles very closely one in the *Hitopadesa*,—"He who doth not hearken to the voice of a friend and well wisher in adversity, is the delight of his enemies." (*Hitopadesa*, Translated by Charles Wilkins, London, 1885, p. 55.)

The connection of the *Conde Lucanor* with Oriental literature was shown by Wolf in the *Wiener Jahrbücher*, 1857, p. 193, and later in his *Studien zur Geschichte der Spanischen und Portugiesischen Nationalliteratur*, Berlin, 1859, where he says (p. 94),

"Es bildet daher recht eigentlich das Mittelglied zwischen den morgen- und abendländischen, und nimmt schon deshalb eine bedeutende Stelle in der Geschichte der Literatur überhaupt in Anspruch."

For further information as to the source the editor is referred to Roscoe: *The Spanish Novelists* (London, 1832). Liebrecht: von der Hagen's *Germania*, 1848, viii, p. 197. [Liebrecht's remarks are repeated almost verb-

ally in his translation of Dunlop. Cf. Dunlop: *Geschichte der Prosadichtungen*, übs. v. Liebrecht (Berlin 1851, p. 501.). Lemcke: *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, 1857, No. 16. Benfey: *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1858, No. 32, p. 318, (Reprinted in Benfey: *Kleine Schriften*, iii, p. 63).

The *Conde Lucanor* was translated by Eichendorff into German in 1840 (Werke, 2. Ausgabe, vi, 424) and into French by Puibusque in 1854. The latter has a dissertation on the sources, and finds the original form of the Talisman story in a tale of Hindu folk-lore to be found in *Die vierzig Veziere*, übs. v. Behnauer (Leipzig, 1851, p. 155). [Cf. also Dunlop: *Geschichte der Prosadichtungen*, übs. v. Liebrecht (Berlin, 1851), p. 524, note 485]. This book *Die vierzig Veziere* (cf. Belletête, *Les Quarante Vizirs*, Paris, 1812), translated into German by Behnauer from the Turkish manuscript in the Dresden royal library, is one of the oldest of all oriental collections of tales. The stories in it arose long before the Christian era in India, from whence they found their way through Arabia into Turkey. (Cf. Loiseleur Deslongchamps, *Essai sur les fables indiennes et sur leur introduction en Europe*, Paris, 1838, p. 130; also H. Keller, *Li Romans des Sept Sages*, Tübingen, 1836, Introduction, p. vii.) According to Behnauer, Prof. Brockhaus has shown the connection of these tales with the popular Hindu Volksbuch, *Das Papageienbuch* (Sanskrit *Čuka Sapatali*; Persian *Tutiname*, in the *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*) Nr. 242, 243, and in his privately printed *Die sieben weisen Meister oder Veziere von Siyâ'eddin Nakhschebi*, Leipzig, 1845. The stories of the *Vierzig Veziere* found their way into almost all the popular collections of Oriental lore; many of them were localized upon Sinbad the Sailor. They came into the Occident with the Moors and were also brought back by the Crusaders.

The plan of the book itself is entirely Oriental; the main thread is similar to the Bible story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife. A young queen, who has tried in vain to gain the affection of her step-son, accuses him of treason to his father the Sultan. The preceptor of the young prince foreseeing by the horoscope forty days of great danger forbids him to speak a word dur-

ing that time. Each night the queen relates a story to her husband the Sultan, and persuades him to have his son beheaded; each day one of the forty Vizirs saves the Prince by admonishing the Sultan with a counter-tale. (Most of these stories became very widely known and are contained in many of the popular *Volksbücher*, for example:

"Die nützliche Unterweisung der sieben weisen Meister, wie Pontianus der König zu Rom, seinen Sohn Diocletianum den sieben weisen meistern befiehlt und wie derselbe hernach durch Untreue seiner Mutter sieben Mal zum Galgen geführt, aber alle Zeit durch schöne Gleichnisse der sieben Meister vom Tod gerettet und ein gewaltiger Meister zu Rom ward. Sehr lustig und nützlich wider der falschen Weiber Untreue zu lesen. Ganz von neuem aufgelegt." Nürnberg?).

On the thirteenth night the queen relates:—A young man once came to a king and said,—“I will weave you a turban which shall be visible only to a legitimate son and invisible to all illegitimately born.” The king gave him much money and fine material, and the man shut himself up in a shop. After several days he appeared before the king with a carefully folded package and said,—“Here is your turban.” The king opened the package in the presence of all his Vizirs and nobles, and saw nothing within. He was almost overwhelmed to learn himself a bastard, but saved himself by pretending to see a beautiful turban and by praising the weaver greatly, who in turn pretended to bind the turban around the king's high hat. When the king put the hat on, all the nobles claimed to see the fine turban and were loud in their praise of the weaver. But there was nothing there. Then the king took his Vizirs aside and told them that he really saw nothing; then they too confessed that they saw nothing at all. They all agreed the young weaver had played them a sly trick for gain.—This is probably the original form of one of the first tales conceived and told by man.

Andersen did not get his story from the original source, but from Don Juan Manuel through Eichendorff. He changed the test from illegitimacy to wickedness or inaptitude, and replaced the negro groom by a simple little child. Such then was the form of the old, old tale, which Fulda found and in which he saw all the possibilities of the keen political

satire we have already noted. It had been used already dramatically by Calderon in his *El Conde Lucanor*, (cf. Münch-Bellinghausen: *Ueber die älteren Sammlungen spanischer Dramen*, Wien, 1852, p. 82.), and by Goldoni in his *Il Talismano*; but these now forgotten dramas were probably not known to Fulda. His fine insight into the significance of the old tale made him incorporate into it the very gist of the *Vierzig Veziere* itself, which he probably never heard of. In Behrnauer (p. 149) we find the Oriental saying, "Die Unwahrheit, welche Heil stiftet, ist besser, als die Wahrheit, welche Unheil stiftet." In Sadi's *Gulistan* we find,—"Die Weisen haben gesagt: Eine Lüge welche gutes bezweckt, ist besser als eine Wahrheit, welche Unheil versteckt," (Graf's Übersetzung, p. 17). And Fulda gave the story again its old Oriental setting. Such is the insight of a true poet.

The editor has nothing to say as to the form into which the *Talisman* is cast. Surely a word or two on the Märchendrama might well have been given for its great literary significance. The Märchendrama arose and flourished in Austria: it was the natural expression of the naive, poetical Viennese temperament. Its most ardent exponent was Raimund, whose *Der Verschwender* contains much the same thought as Grillparzer's remarkable *Der Traum, ein Leben*, which the former recognized as the ideal he had so often striven to attain (Kuh: *Zwei Dichter Oesterreichs*, p. 94). Under Nestroy the Märchendrama degenerated into farce: this desecration practically led Raimund to take his own life. The apotheosis of the Märchendrama was reached in Grillparzer's *Der Traum, ein Leben*. Fulda had studied this wonderful drama, and saw in it a form of dramatic art which, used discretely, and not too often (Grillparzer himself noted this: cf. *Grillparzer-Jahrbuch*, iii, p. 147; the views of the two poets Grillparzer and Bauernfeld, and the two dramaturgists Schreyvogel and Deinhardstein are most instructive), could express more real truth than all the realistic formlessness of modern stage-plays. Let any one compare Fulda's Rita with Grillparzer's Mirza, and he will see at once how much the *Talisman* is indebted to *Der Traum, ein Leben*. Fulda restored again to their old

supremacy the fine fancy and rich imagination of the German poet. He realized one of the fundamental facts of art, that for each folk there is an indigenous form in which alone its genius can be fully expressed. *Faust* itself is really a Märchendrama on a colossal scale. Fulda's lead with *Der Talisman* (1893) was soon followed by Hauptmann with *Die versunkene Glocke* (1896), and by Sudermann with *Die drei Reiherfedern* (1898). Wildenbruch made the first ineffectual attempt at the fantastic-satirical drama in his *Das heilige Lachen*, but to Fulda's genius alone is due the revival of the Märchendrama.

(To be continued.)

EDWARD STOCKTON MEYER.

Western Reserve University.

#### SPANISH PUBLICATIONS.

##### IV.<sup>1</sup>

8. *Don Gil de las calzas verdes, comedia en tres actos y en verso, por Fray Gabriel Téllez (el Maestro Tirso de Molina)*. Edited with an introduction, notes and vocabulary by BENJAMIN PARSONS BOURLAND, Ph. D., Assistant Professor in the University of Michigan. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1901. 8vo, pp. xxvii+198.

DR. BOURLAND, in the Introduction to his edition of *Don Gil*, sets forth, in eleven well-written pages, all that needs to be said about the author and his works, due credit being given to Cotarelo; seven pages deal, concisely but to the point, with the Metre of the play; while a careful Bibliographical Note gives the titles of thirty-one works whose study, in addition to that of the well-known handbooks on the Spanish drama, is all-important for a proper appreciation of the wittiest and least conventional, if not the greatest, of Spanish dramatists.

The play itself (about two thousand five hundred verses) is followed by twenty-four pages of Notes, in which the editor has, with refreshing good sense, omitted translations and what he rightly calls "the commonplaces of history and mythology," and by a Vocabulary that refrains from making "definitions broader or deeper than the text requires." The volume has in front a good reproduction of the author's

<sup>1</sup> Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES for January, 1898 (vol. xiii, col. 39).



portrait—a new and highly commendable feature in our textbooks.

The Introduction could not be expected to furnish new facts about Tirso's life or proclaim new discoveries in the bibliography of his works. Since the publication of Cotarelo's excellent little monograph (1893) no one but Doña Blanca de los Ríos had undertaken a task so arduous, and no part of her investigations has, to my knowledge, been printed except the curious, though unconvincing, articles in *La España Moderna*, in which she attempted to identify Tirso with the elusive Avellaneda, the author of the spurious second part of *Don Quixote*. Our editor has wisely kept aloof from this contention that has called forth no small amount of literature. He also leaves untouched Salvá's claim (*Catálogo*, 1441; 1443) that the first edition of the *Cigarrales* is of 1621, a claim that appears to have been overthrown by Morf.<sup>2</sup> He has summed up all that is essential in Cotarelo, not, however, without carefully testing the latter's conclusions, and arriving occasionally at different and well-argued results. Particularly pleasant to note is Dr. Bourland's unaffected enthusiasm and appreciative reverence for Tirso—of which more anon, when we consider the Notes.

Perhaps, in his note to p. xiv, he might also have spoken of Tirso's plays as reworked by Dionisio Solís, in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Solís had in his day a well-earned reputation as an adapter of classic plays, and a goodly part of Tirso's vogue in those years was undoubtedly due to the intelligent way in which his almost forgotten works were brought before the public.

The various metres found in *Don Gil* are first discussed, and then tabulated by acts and scenes, in pp. xvi-xxiii of the Introduction. The editor's considerations are most acceptable, being clearly worded and, therefore, easily understood. Possibly it might be better to substitute some other word for "regularly" in: "Hiatus between words regularly results in synizesis" (p. xvii), inasmuch as the second example there given admits of no such contraction between the words *No hay*, which in numerous other cases, for instance, in the

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Bulletin Hispanique*, iv, No. 1 (Janvier-Mars 1902), p. 40.

verses quoted on p. xxi, becomes imperative. But as Dr. Bourland expresses his hope of publishing a more extended study of hiatus in Tirso, we can well afford to look forward toward seeing this vexatious question competently disposed of for at least one of the foremost dramatic poets.

The editor has preferred the name *cuartetos* for the more current one of *redondillas*, and his remarks on pp. xviii, xxi and xxii might perhaps at first sight be somewhat puzzling to a beginner. Namely, the *redondilla* is not alone the usual, but the only form of the *cuarteto* as such (that is to say, if we consider the *décima* as a unit) in this play, and there is no difference between *Act i, scene 1*, verses 1-60, tabulated as *cuartetos* (*redondillas*) and those named only *cuartetos* in the other scenes. We might advocate the usual and convenient name *romance* for the

"combination of *versos libres*, or blank verses, of eight syllables, with alternating *octosílabos* that rime [read: assonance] with one another, in long series."

This form, true to its history, is indicated where a personage relates his life, as in our play *Act i, scene 1*, and *Act ii, scene 5*, and it is comparatively rare to find it used for dialogue, as in *Act i, scenes 9-10*. The *terza rima* has in Spanish the name *tercelos*, and a word about its conclusion might perchance be of value. Be it also noted here that the verse-form of *Act i, scene 7*, can hardly be called *quintillas*, in spite of its strophe of five lines; while the *décima* of *Act i, scene 6*, is not a model of its kind.

Inadvertencies so slight do not keep this presentation of the metre from being a good and instructive basis for the student's work in the promising field of Spanish versification. The editor deserves our sincere thanks for having begun by brushing aside the mistake of using the term "feet" in connection with Spanish verse. One becomes more and more strengthened in the conviction that the superstition about "feet" is a serious handicap for the understanding of Spanish verse, the conditions being such that it would go hard to find a poem in which, even when the author pretends to write in "feet," the spirit of the language has not made it impossible to be consistent in their use.

In the preparation of the text of the play, the editor has been favored by the circumstance that the *princeps* edition showed none of the distressing imperfections so common in the seventeenth century volumes of dramatic works. Not a verse had dropped out, and hardly a misprint could be detected. Where, moreover, so careful a critic as Hartzenbusch has twice edited this play, it might be presumed that the present text would be excellent. And, in fact, only a few corrections are needed to make it as perfect as a text can be when its final form, in the author's own handwriting, is not available.

On p. 60, after l. 46, we must insert:

*Doña Juana.* Muestra. (*Ap.* ¡Ay cielos!) a passage that has dropped out in printing, as proven by the verse-numbers.

It might be well to give, at the beginning of the play, the list of *Personas*, preferably with a footnote setting forth their relation to each other.

P. 7, l. 203 calls for a conjectural emendation that will, I trust, do away with all difficulty. Namely, if we read:

Mas la sospecha . . .  
Adivinó mis desgracias,  
Sabiéndolas descubrir  
El oro *en que* dos diamantes  
Bastantes son para abrir  
Secretos de cal y canto.

the meaning becomes: 'the gold [ornament], two diamonds [set] in which.' A change so slight is legitimate, and the syntax should satisfy even so watchful an editor. That Hartzenbusch could overlook so obvious a correction is indeed surprising.

P. 9, l. 21:

¿Que tantos habéis tenido?

means in its connection: [do you mean to say] that you have had so many? ¿Qué tantos...?, how many...? would better befit the wail that elicits the question.

P. 11, l. 80, rather than

*Ojeaba* dos autores,

I should read:

*Hojeara* dos autores,

for examples abound of *hojear un libro, un autor*, while it would take long to find *ojea* with a meaning appropriate to this passage.

The substitution of *Don Andrés* for *Don Martín* on p. 18, l. 38, seems felicitous, especially in view of l. 40, where only Don An-

drés can be meant. Were it not for this latter line, the meaning: 'a child (or: children) of Don Martín and my child' would be logical enough.

P. 25, l. 6, the verse surely demands *Bene venuto*; for the same reason, p. 28, l. 74, lacking one syllable, is improved by Hartzenbusch's *cuando* for *que*; and again, l. 80 is not mangled overmuch by reading with Hartzenbusch:

Cosa que no *es* esté bien.

P. 31, l. 157, should of course be contracted into *ápartesé* (compare p. 81, l. 68: *suelleté*, and p. 89, l. 42: *Hablamé*).

P. 37, l. 31, the *busquen* is inadmissible; Hartzenbusch reads *buscan*, the only possible form.

P. 56, l. 23, and p. 70, l. 22, it would seem better to transfer to the Notes the passages between [ ], since it is customary thus to mark inserted words, not the eliminated passages. P. 63, l. 6, should, inversely, have [es]; p. 73, l. 24, [señor]; and p. 108, l. 10, [ya].

The editor rejected Hartzenbusch's emendation of *su* for *tu* on p. 27, l. 32, saying in the Notes that it is "happy... but... unnecessary." I venture to submit that, since Caramanchel is not aware of Doña Juana's being a woman, the remark would be uncalled for, and *su*, as applied to *dinero*, surely impresses me as the only appropriate reading.

A curious and subtle point of Spanish syntax and, incidentally, also of versification, comes up in connection with a passage on p. 63. The text has:

¿Porqué mintiendo, Inés, me desvaneces?  
Don Andrés ¿no me ha escrito por este hombre?  
¿No dice que es Don Gil el que aborreces?

to which the editor remarks:

"The reading of the first edition is: *No dize que Don Gil el que aborreces?* a misprint, in which the predicate *es*, supplied in the text, is omitted before *Don Gil*; Hartzenbusch reads *no dices*, a peculiarly inept emendation."

At first sight we might incline to assent, for we may translate:

'Inés, why do you mislead me with lies? Has not Don Andrés written to me in favor of this man? Does he not say that the one you detest is Don Gil?'

which looks plausibly simple; while it would appear as if Hartzenbusch had meant, either: 'Has not Don Andrés written to me in favor of this man? Do you not say that the one you de-

test is *Don Gil?*,' or else: '*Do you not say that Don Gil is the one you detest?*'

Either construction would fully warrant the editor's indignant comment. But there remains one other possible meaning that well deserves our attention.

Hartzenbusch's line would have looked less intricate if he had printed:

¿No, dices, es Don Gil el que aborreces?

but he rightly retained the *que*, in the first place because the original edition had *que*, and secondly, because the word is the constant complement of verbs that mean 'to say,' 'to ask,' and so forth. Sentences like: '¿Quién es este señor?' 'Dices *que* ¿quién es? Pero ¡hombre! ¡si es mi padre!' explain themselves.

In Spanish dramatic literature the negative word *no* has a somewhat exasperating way of appearing at the beginning of a phrase when, from the un-Spanish point of view, we might wish it to stand immediately before the very words it is meant to negative. The matter has not, to my knowledge, been dealt with in treatises on Spanish syntax, and would well repay a special investigation; but I am not prepared to doubt that Hartzenbusch, the hair-splitting and wonderfully well-read commentator of *Don Quijote*, was quite familiar with it.

The basic principle is that in Spanish a word, when transferred to a place other than its usual one, thereby becomes more conspicuous, and consequently more emphatic. In the verse as emended by Hartzenbusch, the *no* can belong not only to *dices*, but also to *es*, which makes the passage say:

'Has not Don Andrés written to me in favor of this man? [Then how in the world can] you say that the one you detest is not Don Gil?'

My impression is that this version is most befitting the speaker's dignified anger, and surely more forcible than the simple repetition, in different words, of his first question. If Dr. Bourland, who is well familiar with spoken Spanish, reads the verse aloud, in a tone of wondering inquiry and with strong emphasis on *no*, this interpretation may yet find favor with him, while a search through a few dozen plays, especially Alarcón's, will not fail to furnish examples in justification of Hartzenbusch.

However, my defense of Hartzenbusch in no wise takes away from the merit of our editor's own emendation, which for purposes of a

school text is satisfactory enough. Still, I cannot refrain from pointing once more to the endless watchfulness we should exercise over our opinions in the matter of Spanish, the most difficult, and for that very reason the most fascinating, of our modern languages.

Now, if with Hartzenbusch we read *dices*, it may be asked: Does not the sentence become more grammatical when we transpose the *no* to its logical place, as follows:

¿Dices que no es Don Gil el que aborreces?

Strictly speaking, so it would; but the *no* then would stand in hiatus, and lose thereby part of its emphasis, so that the sentence would hardly mean more than: 'Did I understand you right?' This same consideration of emphasis should, I think, be taken into account in any careful study of the treatment of hiatus; perhaps it may furnish a clue to many apparent irregularities of such treatment, or, at least, the results of such a study could scarcely be deemed conclusive if the possibilities of emphasis were overlooked.

On pp. 76, ll. 73-78; 90, l. 67; 108, ll. 24-27, it might be well to place ( ) around the *aparte* speech, in order to simplify the student's task.

On pp. 81-82, in the passage:

¿Manjar soy que satisfago

Antes que me pruebe el gusto?

we must interpret: 'Am I a relish that satiates before the palate tastes me?' I prefer to read:

¿Manjar soy que satisfago,

Antes que me pruebe, el gusto?

which would mean: 'Am I a relish that satiates his desire before he has a taste of me?'

P. 101, ll. 5-10, our text has:

El temor

De que en penas anda, muda

Mi valor en cobardía.

En no meterme me fundo

En cosas del otro mundo,

Que es bárbara valentía.

We may translate this: 'I am scared! The reason is that I don't *poke my nose into* things of the other world, which is foolhardiness.' Hartzenbusch reads:

En no meterme me fundo

Cos cosas del otro mundo;

Que es bárbara valentía.

This seems to be far preferable, for it means: 'I am scared! The reason is that I don't *beard* spooks, for that is foolhardiness.'

This is all that I find to observe here about the form of the text, and we can pass on to the



Notes. They are differentiated advantageously from the "Notes" so frequent in our Spanish textbooks, in that they contain much valuable information, in place of startlingly novel misinterpretations that would move a cynic to tears of joy. Especially may we be thankful for the pretty note on p. 141, even though the *seguidilla* has since been printed elsewhere (*Revue Hispanique*, viii, 321, no. 166).<sup>3</sup> I had hoped to repay the editor in kind, but the expressions *cazolero* (p. 131) and *macho de Vamba* (p. 142) have, as yet, eluded the most determined search.<sup>4</sup> For lack of better, the following remarks may perhaps be acceptable.

The last note of p. 123 puzzles me greatly. I heartily share the editor's frank and healthy admiration for Tirso, and with him deplore whatever blemishes bedim the lustre of the great poet's worth; but I fail to see what is wrong in the syntax of i, 8, 14, and ii, 5, 79, to which he takes exception; while ii, 10, 23 and ii, 18, 21-22 may well beset down to the printer of the *princeps*.

P. 126, 89, *le ha dado garrotillo*, is not impersonal, for *garrotillo* is the subject. Literal translation: 'croup has stricken him.'

P. 127, 223. It would seem that there is nothing obscure about the passage, for the editor's first interpretation is most lucid. Perhaps, if we render *moscatel* by 'dude' (p. 17, l. 286, it is adjective) the version might be even more plausible. Covarrubias says: "Moscatel, lo que tiene sabor de musco, vulgarmente dicho almizcle"—from which the transition to an effeminate person is natural.

P. 136, 24: ¡Bonita es ella!, translated: "That's a good one!" is perhaps somewhat misleading. I might suggest: 'That would be just like her!' of course to be taken ironically.

P. 139, 118. If the old punctuation were

3 In the form of a *copla* we find it as follows:

La novia que pretendí  
Todas las *efes* tenía:  
Francisca, Francha y *fregonia*,  
Fea, floja, flaca y fra.

(*Cancionero popular turolense* . . . por Severiano Dopporto. Segunda edición, Madrid, Fé, s. a. (1900), no. 567.) See also: Rodríguez Marín, *Cantos populares*, tomo iv, no. 5830, and note.

4. In vol. i of the *Entremeses* of Quiñones de Benavente (*Libros de antano*, tomo 1), an actress addresses all the occupants of the *cazucla* as "cazolería" (p. 151), and one single occupant as "cazolerilla" (p. 221). It therefore looks as if in our play *Doña In. s.*, by her "Cazolero?" means: 'Would you like to sit down among us?' or to put it in the form of a noun: '[Are you] a ladies' man?' The continuation of the scene appears to bear out this assumption.

retained, *transformó* would have for a subject the *riqueza* of l. 119. We may be glad the editor overlooked this possibility, for his emendation is singularly felicitous.

P. 139, 11. *Dinero de Valencia*. Covarrubias says:

"Dinero en el Reyno de Valencia es moneda menuda: vale lo que en Castilla tres blancas: un real Castellano vale veinte y tres dineros. . . Dinerillo, la dicha moneda Valenciana."

It would seem, therefore, that in our passage the expression means something very small, that easily slips through the fingers.

P. 140, 93-94, read: *mulas de collera*, 'draught mules.'

P. 142, 53. The editor has of course noticed that *mira*, in the passage on p. 90, l. 3, has for a subject *él* (that is Don Gil). The scene is curiously interesting for its use of the pronoun of address: first familiar *tú*, then scornful *él*, presently haughty *vos*, and again friendly *tú*.

It is curious to see that p. 1, l. 17, Tirso speaks of the sand of the Manzanares as *rojo*. The adjective is certainly not appropriate at present. Has the color changed in these three centuries, or did the word *rojo* denote a different tint? P. 110, l. 14 makes me suspect that it meant 'blond'; in fact, the distinction between shades of color is rather vaguely indicated in classical Spanish. In this passage there may perhaps be an intention to make the sand blush for shame of its river.

About the *casas á la malicia* (p. 110, l. 5) I may furnish this note, quoting from Mesonero Romanos (*El antiguo Madrid*, 1861, p. xxxix-xl; 1881—a much more accessible edition—tomo i, pp. 64-65):

"... otra razón muy poderosa para limitar y reducir á mezquinas condiciones el caserío general de Madrid, fué la gravosa carga que el establecimiento de la corte trajo consigo, y era la conocida con el nombre de *Regalía de aposento*. Este pesado servicio del alojamiento de la real comitiva y funcionarios de la corte, recaía naturalmente sobre las casas que tenían más de un piso y cierta espaciosidad, . . . razón por la cual continuaron las construcciones de *malicia* ó sólo piso bajo, etc."

The Vocabulary is in keeping with the excellence of the book. In many cases its renderings are made more valuable by specific references to the passages in the text. The only slips worth indicating here are: *á lo*

*caponil*, 'capon style, capon wise'; *correrse*, 'to get (be) ashamed' (p. 1, l. 18); *dar de*, 'to hit with, to deal (blows)'; *sea á merced*, '[for pay] I'll take my chances on your generosity' (p. 16, l. 259); *ofrecer*, 'to promise' (p. 21, l. 14); *pasar, v. a.*, 'to do' (p. 39, l. 102); *plata quebrada* refers us to a note that, to my regret, seems to have dropped out in printing. It would, perhaps, have proven that the term can mean "small change," a signification with which I am unfamiliar—at least, it cannot pertain to the passage of p. 81, l. 62, where the translation is: 'battered plate' (that is, as good as coin, because the real ownership cannot be proven).

Summing up, it is a pleasure to record that Dr. Bourland has approached his task in a truly scholarly spirit. The text of the play, if overhauled once more (in which the publisher should also do his share, for the type betrays many signs of long use), may well be accepted as final and standard; while the Introduction and Notes are far and away the best that have yet accompanied a Spanish text published in this country. In short, this edition of *Don Gil* deserves to be ranked with our best school-editions of French and German classics, the more so, since for Spanish classic dramas, with hardly an exception, the editor must be his own pioneer, even to the establishing of his text and the making of his dictionary and grammar.

F. DE HAAN.

Bryn Mawr College.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

#### HISTORY OF THE INTERNATIONAL CORRESPONDENCE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Some years ago, soon after the first introduction of the International Correspondence between Professors, Teachers, Students, professional men and women, and others, for the purpose of making a more complete and practical study of foreign languages, my attention was first turned toward this new departure in the educational field by Prof. Thomas A. Jenkins, then Professor of the Ro-

mance Languages in Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, and now Professor in the same department in the University of Chicago. He had at that time a few students entering upon this work. Of course it will be understood that I refer to the system devised by Prof. P. Mieille, of the Lycée de Tarbes, of Tarbes, France, and who is this year the French editor of *Comrades All*. I introduced the system at once into Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, and since that time a very considerable number of the students in French, and later quite a number of those in German, have been engaged in this correspondence. Gradually, by a series of letters in the public journals explaining this correspondence, and setting forth its advantages for all pursuing the study of spoken foreign languages, the attention of teachers, especially those of the Modern Languages, was turned toward the subject, and in several schools and colleges its introduction was begun. About this time quite an exhaustive history of the system abroad was prepared and published by Prof. Gaston Mouchet of Paris, and this was translated into English, and published in a leading educational New England magazine, the *Education* of Boston, Mass. This was the most effective public movement yet made, and about a year later the attention of the Modern Language Association of America was directed to it by a paper presented at their Annual meeting at the University of Virginia. At that meeting a committee of four was appointed to make further investigation, and report to the Association the result of their investigations at the annual meeting to be held the Christmas week of the following year. This was held at Columbia University (1899), when a very satisfactory report was presented, and the committee was continued, and five more members were added to the number, making a committee of nine, having general charge of the subject, with its central Bureau at Swarthmore College, at Swarthmore, Pa. That committee made a full report in 1900, at the annual meeting held at the University of Pennsylvania, and the committee was again continued without change. The present condition of the correspondence will be best understood by quoting from the Report made at

the Annual meeting at Harvard University, recently held in Christmas week. Without adhering to the exact language of the report, the general result reached can be stated as follows: The report of the previous year having been published in *MOD. LANG. NOTES*, of which a number of deprints were issued and distributed widely among teachers as circulars of information and encouragement, and later, the report having appeared in the published "Proceedings" of the Association, a very considerable impulse was given to the movement during the first year of the twentieth century, and during that year applications for correspondents were received at the central Bureau at Swarthmore, from eleven universities, seven colleges, four High Schools, and thirty one private persons. While this was encouraging, it leaves a very large part of our educational institutions, and the community in general, quite outside of the movement, yet to be reached by further strenuous effort, and an earnest propaganda worthy of so important a cause. The number of applications received in the year 1901 from the sources above named was as follows: three hundred and twenty-one for French correspondents, two hundred and fifty-seven for German, eleven for Italian, and six for Spanish correspondents. It will be seen that, these five hundred and ninety applicants having been supplied, it brings eleven hundred and eighty persons into communication with each other, each in two languages, during the past year, through the action of the Bureau direct, besides the large number of the friends of these who hear of the system, and are known to have furnished correspondents to each other, of which the Bureau has no account and no direct information.

And this introduces another side of this subject, never sufficiently considered, which requires explanation. Teachers often say that their hours for class instruction are so few and so crowded that they have not time to introduce this correspondence. It is precisely because of this condition of the class-work that this system affords relief, instead of giving an added burden to bear. No time whatever need be occupied with the correspondence during the recitation hours, but the students of different nationalities being once introduced

to each other, and started in the work, carry it on themselves, without assistance from their teachers, receiving all needed assistance from each others criticisms and corrections. This is not mere theory, but practice, as I have observed it in my classes from year to year. An occasional letter of special interest, or amusing errors made in attempts at a foreign tongue, may occasionally be read in class as a variation of the monotony of what is sometimes too dull and tedious, and this can be done without at all exposing the names of the writers of such letters, if so desired. And it has been observed that the added interest in the class shown by those who are corresponding, and who have been corresponding longest, makes of a study which might otherwise become dull and monotonous, a study full of vitality and spirit. One may almost say that it gives the work a new meaning, changing it from the dull study of a dead unspoken language to that which may be called a living language indeed. And again, this work begun in term time, is not suspended in vacations, for the interest of vacation, at home and in travel, inspires the student with new themes, and thus the correspondence once well started in term time, is active throughout the entire year. And not only so, it goes on from year to year, long after leaving school or college, and may lead to many new friendships and business relations, and thus be a life long source of pleasure and profit to those thus engaged. It is hoped, therefore, that teachers will no longer say that they have not the time necessary for the introduction of the International Correspondence; on the other hand, they are too much crowded by the work, in the ordinary way, to be able to do without the relief which this correspondence affords.

The financial side of the question requires a brief notice. The aim of the bureau is to make as light a charge as possible, to cover the actual expense incurred for stamps, stationery, type-writing, printing circulars, etc., including foreign fees when charged abroad. And this expense is incurred but once, and not repeated in any individual cases after the correspondence is once begun. This may be illustrated by saying that the entire amount of fees paid this bureau in 1901 is an average of



about ten cents for each person supplied. Of course to secure this result the labor of office work is given without charge.

The report of the Committee on the International Correspondence given at Harvard concluded with an earnest recommendation to patronize and circulate as widely as possible the new Annual started last Easter, and issued from the office of the *Review of Reviews* in London, called in English *Comrades All*. It is believed that this annual, published in three or four languages, will prove an invaluable aid in propagating the correspondence in England, France, Germany, and America, and probably in Italy and Spain, where this movement is beginning to assume a promising condition.

EDWARD H. MAGILL,

*Chairman of the International Correspondence Committee of the Modern Language Association of America.*

*Swarthmore College.*

#### RABELAIS' PANTAGRUEL.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In the February number of 1901 I called attention to the discovery, by Rosenthal of Munich, of what he believed to be the original text of the fifth book of Rabelais' *Pantagruel*. It looks very much as if the hopes at first entertained with regard to the value of the find must be given up.

A careful examination has been made by experts (Gaston Paris, Émile Picot, Abel Lefranc, Henri Stein, etc.) and they are unanimous in declaring that there can be nothing common between Rabelais and the text owned by Rosenthal.

The impression of those scholars who were in a position to judge *de visu* is well summed up by H. Stein, archivist at the "Archives Nationales" in Paris, in his communication to the *Bibliographie Moderne*, which is reprinted separately by Picard et Fils, Paris, 1901, under the title: *Un Rabelais apocryphe de 1549*.

The book was without doubt printed in the sixteenth century—1549 as the title page indicates—during the time of Rabelais; but it is nevertheless an important forgery. Moreover a poor and careless forgery. The style is absolutely colorless. As to the contents, several extracts given by Stein more than suffice to

convince one that anything but the Rabelaisian genius is to be found in these pages.

Then, there is no fourth chapter, while on the other hand, there are two twelfth and two thirteenth chapters. The very handsome binding betrays almost certainly a Lyonnaise origin; thus probably the book was printed at Lyons; but the printing is very far from perfect. The capital letters at the head of the chapters are of different types. Occasionally they are missing altogether, or replaced by small letters of the ordinary type of the book in the midst of large blank squares. Again misprints are frequent, and a remarkable quantity of misplaced and senseless apostrophes are scattered all over the pages. In short, says M. Stein: "Ce serait folie que de voir là autre chose qu'une vulgaire et malhonnête contrefaçon."

The author probably belonged to the large class of the dissatisfied of the sixteenth century; he wanted a universal reform of society, and thought he might bring it about by attacking everybody and everything: State, church, nobles, the rich, priests, lawyers, women, etc. In order to give more force to his tirades he chose to publish them under the name of Rabelais.

Did Rabelais himself know anything about it? Among the "lettres patentes" of Henri II there is one (August 6, 1550) which shows that he complained of bad and inaccurate reprints of his books, and even of insipid and scandalous imitations. (See for a copy of this letter the Rabelais edition of the Bibliophile Jacob, Paris, 1840, p. li of the Preface.) But it is impossible to say whether he knew of the special text under discussion. Stein has found no condemnation of it in the "Arrêts du Parlement."

Thus it appears that the discovery of M. Rosenthal will not help to solve a single one of the numerous questions connected with the fifth book of *Pantagruel*. It leaves the problem exactly where it was before.

One minor point is interesting. Folio 14 contains a part of the text printed in the form of a bottle. Stein remarks about it:

"On ne peut, en la voyant [la bouteille] paratre ici, s'empêcher de songer immédiatement à la dive bouteille toute revestue de pur et beau cristallin, en forme ovale dont Bacbuc explique la glose à Panurge au Ve livre de

Pantagruel (chap. xlv). Je n'irai pas jusqu' à affirmer que Rabelais en a emprunté l'idée à son contrefacteur: j'admèrerais l'ironie! mais il n'y en a pas moins là un rapprochement curieux qui éveille l'attention. C'est d'ailleurs l'unique point de ressemblance entre les deux publications."

ALBERT SCHINZ.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

OTWAY'S *Orphan*: SMOLLETT'S *Count Fathom*.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Certain similarities between Otway's *Orphan* and Smollett's *Count Fathom* should be noted, if attention has not already been called to them. Otway's tragedy is the story of Monimia, the orphan daughter of a soldier named Chamout, a Bohemian gentleman, and a comrade in arms of Acasto, a Bohemian nobleman, who is one of the characters in the play. Chamout, dying a widower after losing his property in "the late and civil discords," left his daughter to the care of Acasto, by whom she was reared as if she had been his own child.

Acasto has twin sons, Castalio and Polydore. Castalio loves Monimia, and desires to make her his wife; and they are secretly married in the third act of the drama. Polydore professes to love Monimia, too, but his desires are not honorable. With the success of Polydore's designs, and the catastrophe that ensues we have nothing to do; but it may be mentioned that Monimia poisons herself, and that Polydore, in deepest contrition, impales himself upon Castalio's sword.

In Smollett's tale, Renaldo Melvil is a young Hungarian nobleman, who, wandering to Spain, falls in love with Serafina, the daughter of Don Diego de Zelos, a Spanish nobleman. His love is returned, but, as Renaldo is disguised as a poor, wandering music-teacher, Don Diego is enraged at the thought of his daughter wedding one in such a station. Smollett makes it appear that Diego has killed the lover, but it develops later that it was a burglar whom he slew in the darkness. He then administers poison to his wife and daughter, and, believing them dead, leaves Spain.

Renaldo then takes Serafina and her mother to England, where the mother soon dies.

About this time, Ferdinand, who has assumed the title "Count Fathom," and who is the foster-brother of Renaldo, arrives in England, meeting Serafina there. Serafina's identity must be concealed to guard against her being discovered by a powerful Spanish suitor, and hence Smollett introduces her into the story as "a young lady whom for the present we shall call Monimia, a name that implies her orphan situation." This phraseology may refer directly to Otway's *Orphan*, or it may be a mere interpretation of the name itself. Fathom at once lays siege to Monimia's heart, with the most dishonorable intentions, not only towards his friend and foster-brother, Renaldo, but also towards Monimia herself. Here we have almost exactly the same situation as in Otway.

Renaldo returning to Hungary on a business visit, Monimia, or Serafina, is almost entirely in the power of Fathom, from whom Smollett rescues her by the clumsy artifice of illness, simulated death, and a pretended funeral.

It may be added that Fathom afterwards repents of his misdeeds, and appears to have reformed. See conclusion of the book. Moreover, in the person of Grieve, the apothecary, he reappears (not the only time that Smollett uses this trick) in *Humphrey Clinker*, being now a "sincere convert to virtue," and "universally respected." See, in *Clinker*, letter of Matthew Bramble, dated Harrowgate, June 26.

We know that *The Orphan* was popular in Smollett's day, and it seems that the novelist, himself also a dramatist and a student of the drama, deliberately used such parts of a favorite play as seemed desirable.

J. W. PEARCE.

*Boys' High School, New Orleans.*

MEYER'S *Grundriss der neueren deutschen Literaturgeschichte*.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Prof. Meyer having, in a private letter, taken polite exception to part of my notice of his *Grundriss* in the June number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, a few supplementary words may not be out of place.

Prof. Meyer questions the utility of the corrections regarding the change of publishers for

the works listed, and of the suggestion that the size and price of the works be noted. It is true that most German users of the *Grundriss* can get such added information, on matters subject to frequent change, easily and expeditiously from their booksellers. My suggestions, however, were made principally from the point of view of the user of the book who has no German bookstore conveniently at hand, and with the conception of a bibliography as essentially a time-saving device.—The somewhat obvious fact escaped me that dates of death are given in the *Grundriss* only for authors whose death occurred since the appearance of the author's *Litteraturgeschichte*.

I hope it was clear to everyone who read my review that the long list of corrections, printed for the behoof of the possessors of the *Grundriss* as well as of the author, applied largely to relatively unimportant details. It was furthest from my thought to suggest the least doubt as to the value of this important work, to which the much-abused word "indispensable" really applies.

JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN.

Iowa College.

#### ALLOTRIA II.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—I. In his *Bemerkungen zum Havelok*, *Engl. Stud.* xxix, 371, Morsbach seems to have taken a brief Homeric nap. He writes: "Das Wort *oure* (ae. *ofer* m. 'ufer') fehlt bei Stratmann-Bradley." And asks, farther on: "Ist *over* (ae. *ofer*) sonst noch [that is, besides *Havelok* 321] im Mittenglischen belegt?"

The word *över* 'shore' is in Stratmann-Bradley, 465 b, where this *Havelok* passage is cited, also *Layamon* 8584, Robert Manning's *History* 4336; to these may be added (from Skeat's Glossary to *Havelok*) *Layamon* 31117. In all, there are four passages. It is interesting to note that in all four the word is used in the rime *over*: *Dover*; apparently a riming formula in M. E. poetry.

In the interval between the writing and the printing of this paper Holthausen has pointed out Morsbach's error; see *Engl. Stud.* xxx, 343.

2. To the two *Wulfstan* passages containing O. E. *and*='if,' cited by Wülfing, *Angl. Beibl.* xii, 89, and the *Exodus* (Ælfric) passage cited

by Einkenkel, Paul, *Grundr.* §164.7 (the passage is *Ex.* iv, 23), may be added: *and* he *larum wile* . . . *minum hyran*, *Juliana* 378; *and hæbbe* on his *wæstmæ* *golian mycelnysse*, *Angels. Homilien*, etc., ed. Assmann, p. 40/411 (tr. 'mag er auch haben' by Pogatscher, *Angl.* xxiii, 287); *gelice and*='sicut' in Alcuin *Virt.* lines 88, 97, 330 (*Anglia* xi, 371-391) and in *Oros.* 74/24, 92/15. Also to be noted in this connection is the use of *and*='quatenus'; see Abbo, *Glossæ* (*Zs. f. d. Alt.* xxxi, 1-27): *quatinus valeas*=*and pæt þa mæge*, 516, *ast colat*=*and begæð*, 402. In *Juliana* 636: *and to þære stowe*, the *and* seems to mean 'usque'. In *Wulfstan* 289/24 the sense 'quatenus' is obscured by Napier's interpolation. The passage reads: God hit *ðe* forgife *and me geunne pæt* ic mote. The *me geunne pæt* is not in the MS.; the priest says to the penitent: God forgive thee so far as in my power lies.

For a discussion of the German *unde* see Kraus, *Zs. f. d. Alt.* xlv, 149-186.

3. Usually Logeman's English is unimpeachable for its accuracy. In *Engl. Stud.* xxix, 431, however, he has fallen into an error which defeats his purpose. Speaking of Cushman's *The Devil and the Vice*, he says:

"The uncomfortable feeling one has, when working through this book, is that precisely subsequent investigations are necessary, i. e., it is not a *definite* book,—not by any means the last word on the subject."

The italicizing is mine. Now the results in Cushman's book are *definite* enough; the objection to them is that they are not *definitive* 'abschliessend, zum Abschluss führend.' I should hardly feel justified in playing the schoolmaster towards a scholarly foreigner, were it not for the observation that only too many Anglo-Americans who ought to know better commit this very blunder.

4. Permit me to raise a voice of indignant protest against the paper in *Engl. Stud.* xxx, 91-117, entitled *Zum Ursprung des Burenkrieges*. With the merits of the paper I have nothing to do. The writer's views may be perfectly sound; I certainly am far from asserting that they are not. What I do assert is that they have *nothing to do* with an *Organ für englische Philologie*. Is the domain of pure and quiet scholarship to be invaded by this rattle of arms?



5. Arthur J. Roberts, in his paper, *Did Hrotswitha Imitate Terence*, NOTES xvi, col. 478-481, may be correct. Yet his remark:

"one cannot imagine any reason why the learned Celtes—poet of reputation as well as scholar—who discovered the manuscripts, should have manufactured them,"

leads me to suspect that he has not perused carefully Aschbach's study *Roswitha u. Conrad Celtes*. Originally printed in the Vienna *Sitzungsberichte*, 1867, lvi, pp. 3-62, it was printed in a second and enlarged edition in 1868. Now Aschbach tells us pretty plainly that the Roswitha dramas are a fabrication of the sixteenth century and supplies for Celtes quite adequate motives. Those scholars who, for example Creizenach, severely ignore Aschbach's investigations and cherish the myth of a Gandersheim dramatic literature in the tenth century, are believing something "too good to be true."

6. Cook, in his edition of the *Christ*, undertakes to explain *attres ord*, 768. In itself the phrase is not self explanatory, and is equally obscure in *Juliana* 471, where the Devil boasts:

misthelme forbrægd

purh attres ord eagna leoman

sweartum scurum, etc., etc.

In *Riddles* lxi, 13, the word *ord* is puzzling:

hu mec seaxes ord ond seo swiþre hond,

eorles ingeþonc ond ord somod

þingum ƿeþydan, etc., etc.

Why should *ord* be repeated so stupidly? Nor is the trouble remedied by Herzfeld's substitution of *ecg*; 'point' and 'edge' amount to the same thing in this connection. We can, however, improve all these passages by reading *oroð* 'breath' for *orod*, as in *Sol. Saturn*, 221,

ðurh attres oroð ingang rymað

7. Why do Kluge-Lutz, *English Etymology*, adhere to the impossible derivation of Mn.E. 'tight' from Icel. *þéttr*, M.E. *thight*. Even Bradley-Stratmann equates *tight* with *þiht*. One would like to know what other instances are found of initial *p* appearing as *t*. No; *þéttr*, *thight*=German *dicht*, whereas *tight* is the Skandinavian *titt*, adverbial neuter of *tíðr*, for example in the formula *hart ok titt*. The *gh* in English is mere spelling analogy, as in *delight*.

J. M. HART.

Cornell University.

## GERMAN LITERATURE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Messrs. F. Schneider & Co. in Berlin have just issued the second (concluding) volume of their encyclopedic work, *Das deutsche Jahrhundert, in Einzelschriften* by a number of specialists, under the general editorship of George Stockhausen. These generously proportioned volumes, of some eight hundred pages each, offer a comprehensive account of the aims and achievements of the Germans during the nineteenth century, grouped under the successive heads of literature, art, philosophy, economics, jurisprudence, history, music, military and naval science, and the several departments of natural science. The work is a small library in itself—or rather, a library of historical treatises, supplemented by the data of a *Grundriss*, for the reader finds at the foot of each page statistical information about all important personages mentioned in the text, together with references to biographical and critical literature.

The first section, *Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (pp. 160), is by Dr. Carl Busse of Berlin, who is himself favorably known as a poet and story-writer of the younger generation, and this section, like the others, is obtainable separately (br. M. 3.—geb. M. 4 —). I am acquainted with no more suitable *vade mecum* for students of contemporary German literature. Dr. Busse gives a bird's-eye view of the whole period from the last years of Schiller's life to the present time, in a series of necessarily brief, but precise, clear, and illuminating characterizations. This is a handy book of reference, but not merely that. The writer is not a mere compiler of statistics, nor yet a juggler with epigrams. He presents a narrative, properly proportioned and skilfully arranged, which can be read with pleasure from beginning to end. He does not profess to make any new contributions to knowledge of the subjects that he treats. His point of view is that of an impartial and independent critic, who sees clearly, feels sympathetically, and sets down his thoughts or impressions with directness and sincerity.

W. G. HOWARD.

Harvard University.